

JPRS-UPA-89-023
13 APRIL 1989



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

19980203 394

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

**Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited**

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-023

CONTENTS

13 APRIL 1989

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

'Social Organizations' to Elect 750 People's Deputies [ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 1, 6-12 Jan 89]	1
LaSSR CP CC Secretary Gorbunov Interviewed [K. Pakalns; CINA, 27 Sep 88]	2
BSSR CP CC Plenum Resolution Staffing Central Committee Commissions [SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 3 Jan 89]	4

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Ambassador Yegorychev on Khrushchev Dismissal, Brezhnev Appointment [L. Pleshakov; OGONEK No 6, 4-11 Feb 89]	8
Former Official on State Media Policies During Early Brezhnev Years [N.N. Mesyatsev; ZHURNALIST No 1, Jan 89]	19

RELIGION

Moscow Patriarchy to Republish Bible [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 12 Mar 89]	25
Essays Examine New Thinking on Religion, Atheism [V. Kharazov; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 19 Nov 88]	25
Moslem Georgians' Reconversion to Christianity Urged [R. Tvaradze; LITERATURULI SAKARTVELO No 51, 23 Dec 88]	26
Adjarians' Ethnic, Religious Bonds With Georgia Stressed [P. Khalvashi; LITERATURULI SAKARTVELO No 51, 23 Dec 88]	28

CULTURE

Critic Rassadin Blasts Writers' Union Conservatives [Skulskaya; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 3 Feb 89]	32
Emigre Poet Korzhavin Interviewed in Moscow [N. Korzhavin; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 15 Feb 89]	33
Lyubimov Stages Banned Play at Taganka [Al. Grinevich; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 28 Feb 89]	34
Films on Armenian Earthquake Planned [R. Gevorkyants; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 28 Feb 89]	35
Ukrainian Film Union Chief Critically Views Culture Ministry Control [M. Belikov; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 21 Feb 89]	36

SOCIAL ISSUES

Deputy Supreme Court Chairman on Desired Legal Reforms [S.I. Gusev; OGONEK No 8, 4-11 Mar 89]	38
Lawyer Rebuts Arguments Favoring Abolition of Death Penalty [S. Samoylov; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 4 Mar 89]	42
Regulations Governing Use of Duplicating Equipment Described [SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 4 Feb 89]	43
Former Captain of 'Admiral Nakhimov' Interviewed at Labor Camp [O. Svishch, V. Korkodym; RABOCHAYA GAZETA 27 Nov 88]	44
Soviet Psychiatrist Interviewed on Effects of Restructuring [B.F. Lomov; TRUD, 3 Feb 89]	45
Issue of Bilingualism in Schools Brings Heated Response [V. Shtrits; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 19 Jan 89]	47
Ministry of Health Continues AIDS Investigation [S. Tutorskaya; IZVESTIYA, 4 Feb 89]	49
Language Problem Remains Unresolved [G. Belger; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 22 Jan 89]	50
Tatar Academic Criticizes Uniform Language Policy for Republics [K. Gizatov; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 31 Jan 89]	53
1988 Birth Rate Drops, UkSSR Not Satisfying Child Nourishment Needs [V. Danilov; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 21 Dec 88]	54
Student Describes Influence of Jewish 'Underground' Group in Kishinev [I. Litvak; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 31 Jan 89]	55
Pravda Hits Inequities in Ashkhabad Living Standards [M. Volkov; PRAVDA, 9 Feb 89]	59

REGIONAL ISSUES

SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA Rebutts Accusations of Estonian-Language Press [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 10 Jan 89]	62
Estonian Writer Details Criticism of Republic Russian-Language Press [T. Kallas; MOLODEZH ESTONII, 12 Jan 89]	64
LaSSR Youth Paper Interviews Visiting European Parliament Members [H.J. Zeyeler; SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, 14 Feb 89]	68
LNIM Activists Present Group's Views in LaSSR Youth Paper Interview [U. Neybergs, V. Mutseniyeks; SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, 14 Feb 89]	69
Latvian Popular Front's Reaction to Press Coverage of Latvian Emigre Meeting Noted [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 17 Dec 88]	73
Lithuanian 'National' Sports Team Proposed [I. Shvets; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 14 Feb 89]	74
Statistics on Nationality Groups, Language Use in Ukraine [KOMMUNIST UKRAINY No 1, Jan 89]	74
Working Group Formed on State Status for Ukrainian Language [PRAVDA UKRAINY, 8 Feb 89]	75
Reader Blasts UkSSR Minister of Trade for Consumer Shortages [V. Khrapachevskyy; MOLOD UKRAYINY, 7 Jan 89]	75
Ukrainian Reader Questions Export of Fuel Oil [V. Kishko; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 7 Jan 89]	76
Reader Charges Officials Arbitrarily Apply Law Against 'Meetings' [I. Kovalchuk; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 7 Jan 89]	76
Official Findings on Chernovtsy Illness Fail To Appease Residents [V. Pelekh; RABOCHAYA GAZETA, 29 Nov 88]	76
Progress in Liquidating Chernobyl's Aftermath in BSSR Examined [A. Gulyayev; SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 22-23 Feb 89]	78
Open House Tours for Public Begin at Rovno AES [I. Pashchuk; RABOCHAYA GAZETA, 19 Jan 89] ...	82
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on Life in Shusha's 'Special District' [N. Belan; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 14 Feb 89]	82
Upcoming Reorganization of Moldavian Light Industry Assessed [S.A. Manukyan; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 3 Feb 89]	84
GSSR First Secretary's Speech at USSR Supreme Soviet Session [D.I. Patiashvili; ZARYA VOSTOKA, 1 Dec 88]	86
Patiashvili Remarks at Tbilisi Gorkom Meeting on November Unrest [ZARYA VOSTOKA, 28 Dec 88] ..	88
UzSSR Economy Falls Short in Many Areas in 1988 [PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 31 Jan 89]	96
Newspaper Courses in Buryat Language Introduced [V. Sbitnev; IZVESTIYA, 21 Feb 89]	98

'Social Organizations' to Elect 750 People's Deputies

18000369 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian
No 1, 6-12 Jan 89 p 2

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY response to letter by G. Yurkin]

[Text] **How many people's deputies will represent our country's social organizations in the USSR Supreme Soviet? What norm has been established for each of them?**

[Signed] G. Yurkin, Moscow

As our correspondent was informed at the Central Election Commission, according to the USSR Constitution and the Election Law, 750 USSR People's Deputies will be elected from social organizations:

—From the Communist Party of the Soviet Union 100 deputies are elected;

—From USSR trade unions—100;

—From the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League—75;

—From Women's Councils joined in the Committee of Soviet Women—75;

—From organizations of veterans of war and labor joined by their All-Union Council—75 deputies;

—The norms of representation for other all-Union organizations in elections, within limits established by law, are determined at joint meetings of the authorized officials of these organizations convoked by the Central Election Commission:

—From cooperative organizations, of the total of 100 deputies 58 will be elected from kolkhozes joined together by the USSR Council of Kolkhoz Members, 40 from the Council of Consumer Societies, and 2 from the All-Union Association of Fishing Kolkhozes;

—From the total of 75 deputies from associations of scientific workers 30 deputies are to be elected from the USSR Academy of Sciences together with 20 scientific societies and 8 associations;

—From the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences Imeni V. I. Lenin—10 deputies;

—From the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR together with 40 medical science societies—10;

—From the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR together with the Soviet Association of Research Pedagogues—5;

—From the Academy of Artists of the USSR—5;

—From the Union of Scientific and Engineering Societies of the USSR—10;

—From the All-Union Society of Inventors and Efficiency Workers—5 deputies.

—The creative unions of the USSR, which under the Law have 75 deputy mandates, distributed them as follows:

—From the Union of Architects, the Union of Journalists, the Union of Cinematographers, the Union of Producers, the Union of Writers, the Union of Theatrical Figures, and the Union of Artists—10 deputies apiece;

—From the Union of Designers—5 deputies.

—From other social organizations formed in the manner established by law and having all-Union organs 75 deputies are elected, including the following:

—From USSR DOSAAF—15;

—From the USSR Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies—10;

—From the All-Union Znaniye Society—10;

—From the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries together with the Soviet Society for Cultural Ties with Countrymen Abroad (the Rodina Society)—5;

—From the Soviet Peace Fund together with 8 Soviet committees who support peace, solidarity, and international cooperation—7.

—From the Soviet Committee for the Protection of Peace together with the Association to Assist Organizations of the United Nations in the USSR—5;

—From the Soviet Culture Fund—5;

—From the Soviet Children's Fund imeni V. I. Lenin—5;

—From the Soviet Fund for Mercy and Health—5;

—From USSR Public Sports Organizations (All-Union Voluntary Physical Training Sports Society of Trade Unions together with the All-Union Trudovyye Resevy Voluntary Sports Society, the All-Union Dinamo Voluntary Sports Society, and the Central Army sports Club)—3;

—From the All-Union Voluntary Society for the Struggle for Sobriety—1;

—From the All-Union Society of Book Lovers—1;

—From the All-Union Society of Friends of the Cinema—1;

—From the All-Union Music Society—1;

—From the All-Union Society of Philatelists—1 deputy.

LaSSR CP CC Secretary Gorbunov Interviewed
18080001 Riga CINA in Latvian 27 Sep 88 p 1

[Interview with the LaSSR CP Central Committee's Secretary Anatoliy Gorbunov concerning the 4th conference of the USSR-USA public representatives in Georgia's capital Tbilisi by CINA's correspondent K. Pakalns: "Edges of Dialog"]

[Text] First of all, let us remind you of certain important facts of the recent past. The first meeting of USSR and U.S. public representatives took place in 1985. At that time, five representatives of our country discussed with their American counterparts the important aspects of relations between the two countries. This meeting took place in a small resort town of Chautaugua, N.Y., which is a significant scientific and cultural center. This meeting became known as the Chautaugua dialog. Unfortunately, this meeting was mostly of a confrontational nature. This discussion was continued in Yurmala [Riga's suburb] in September 1986. This time a substantially larger number of participants (several hundred people in total) participated in the meeting. The next year, the meeting again took place in Chautaugua. The fourth conference of Soviet-American public representatives conference was held this fall. This time it took place in Tbilisi. For six days approximately 500 participants, of whom more than 300 were Americans, discussed different aspects of the USSR-U.S. relations which today worry people all over the world. Representatives of our republic, namely, the LaSSR CP Central Committee's Secretary Anatoliy Gorbunov and the Chairman of the presidium of the Latvian Society for Friendship and Cultural ties with foreign countries Ivars Vikis were among the participants. They departed Georgia's capital on Saturday night. And immediately at Riga's airport Anatoliy Gorbunov had kindly agreed to talk about the most important and interesting impressions of the conference to the CINA's correspondent.

[Pakalns] I think that it would be useful to begin our conversation by giving a comparative assessment of the just concluded meeting. How did the direction of discussions and participants' mood change during these years?

[Gorbunov] To an extent, I can consider myself a veteran of the Soviet-American public representatives' dialog, since I participated in three of the previous conferences. Indeed, it is now important to examine the changes in the relations between both countries. Those can be characterized by one word, namely, essential. Let us remember the meeting in Yurmala in 1986. At that time this dialog started with sensible and dramatic

tension, set up, as we know, by the former U.S. ambassador to Moscow, Jack Matlock. And the general discussion in our resort town was carried out in a quite tense and, at times, even heated atmosphere. Now, I can tell with satisfaction that this belongs to the past. The 3rd conference in Chautaugua was marked by substantially improved attitudes because the participants were trying to find common ground for the problems being discussed. The USSR deputy foreign minister Anatoliy Adamishin spoke about these essential changes at the first plenary session of the conference in Tbilisi. He, an economist by education, is experienced in international affairs and has spent about 30 years in diplomatic service. A. Adamishin had reemphasized facts, namely, that there were 4 summits between the leaders of both countries, that leaders of the Soviet Foreign Ministry and the American State Department have met 28 times, that high level contacts took place between defense officials of both countries, and that more than one hundred U.S. congressmen have visited the Soviet Union. In general, relations have expanded in various areas. Based on these and other aspects, one can see that a certain stability is appearing...At the Tbilisi conference I was especially interested in the position of the official representatives of the USSR and the U.S. on the subjects of interest to both sides.

[Pakalns] And what is your assessment of these positions?

[Gorbunov] Unfortunately, the attitude toward a number of important problems has changed very little. The results, which we anticipated and hoped for, are disproportional to the work that has been carried out.

[Pakalns] Why?

[Gorbunov] Three years ago, the American officials took a position, the essence of which can be characterized in, namely, that of strength. This point of view could be felt this time also. It is true, however, that this attitude has become substantially more sophisticated. The deputy assistant Secretary of State, T. Simon stressed three main aspects of the American Administration's attitude toward the Soviet Union, namely, those of strength, realism, and dialog. Of course, there is no disagreement in assessing the last two aspects. However, we have a different view on the subject of strength. Our partners in dialog have expressed their views in approximately the following words: You are idealists, while we, the Americans, need strength to affirm self-respect, because man created nuclear weapons and will not give them up. In addition, T. Simon stressed that in his opinion strength means defending the American interests and values. Therefore, they may be both purposeful and cruel at the same time... For the sake of objectivity I must add that the speaker himself agreed that the term "dialog from the position of strength" sometimes, to a degree, resembles a dictate and, therefore, may not be accepted by an opponent.

[Pakalns] Indeed, seemingly simple notions sometimes could be diametrically opposite?

[Gorbunov] The Americans often stress the thought that we are different. However, this time at the Tbilisi conference, we also heard encouraging ideas from our partners in dialog. It was stressed that now it would be improper for one side to "wisely" teach the other one, but rather one side should learn from another. This is an important notion, indeed. The opinion that tensions in regional conflicts are originated neither in the Soviet Union nor in the U.S. was expressed. These tensions originate in their own social and political environment. There was a significant acknowledgment by the Americans that they have no intentions of starting a discussion with us concerning the history of the Soviet Union. Of course, this does not mean that our overseas partners cannot express their subjective opinion concerning the matter.

[Pakalns] Such a view can be only welcomed?

[Gorbunov] Definitely. In essence, this is a new policy, a notion in the spirit of modern realism, which should be supported in every possible way. However, these positive aspects of the conference did include some new contradictions. In spite of the fact that five minutes before it was declared that teaching the other partner would not be considered a wise thing to do, this notion was not observed in the subsequent speeches of the American official representatives. For example, the issue of the tragic accident with a South Korean airplane was raised again. At the same time, not a single word was said about the recent Iranian passenger airliner accident caused by the American armed forces. And something else. Our country was reproved for providing help to Afghanistan, Nicaragua, and Angola. Immediately, a question was asked to specify the aid, which the U.S. is so lavishly pouring onto the counterrevolutionary forces of these countries. Unfortunately, there was no answer to this important question.

[Pakalns] Did the Chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, who during the Yurmala conference was at the center of attention of the public and the press, participated in the Tbilisi conference.

[Gorbunov] This time Colonel General Nikolay Chervov discussed with his American partner Maynard Glitman the problems of reducing the conventional and nuclear weapons. The Chief of the General Staff explained our State's strategy for reducing armaments. Because quite a lot was achieved in this field, the representatives of both states can be proud of these achievements.

[Pakalns] Comrade Gorbunov, what is the outlook in this field?

[Gorbunov] Nikolay Chervov stressed that the road to the future will not be easy. However, it is the only

reasonable and correct direction. Our government is of the opinion that it is possible to complete a draft of a treaty, which would provide for a fifty percent reduction in strategic and nuclear weapons. However, there were no constructive answers to this and other important questions. As a result of these questions, the Americans during the Tbilisi conference again called us idealists.

[Pakalns] How was this opinion supported?

[Gorbunov] Quite cleverly. They said that we want to build a house starting from the roof. As to them, the Americans, they do it the opposite way, namely, they start this work by building a strong foundation. One must admit that such a comparison has a really undeniable logic. But let us examine this problem even further. Yes, our proposal to reduce nuclear weapons in half has a revolutionary nature. However, not only military specialists know well that the remaining fifty percent of nuclear weapons are sufficient to eliminate both the USSR and the U.S. in case of war. If so, what kind of idealists can we be? An interesting discussion took place on the subject of what would be the direction of ties between both countries if Ronald Reagan would accept the proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev in Reykjavik. Immediately, a thought that the Soviet proposal was at that time too revolutionary and impulsive was expressed. Therefore, it was rejected. At the same time, it was recognized that if the mutual agreement would be reached in Reykjavik, both countries would not achieve the improved relations they have now.

[Pakalns] How were the discussions concerning human rights carried out?

[Gorbunov] Last year's dialog in Chautaugua and this year's dialog in Tbilisi were not especially profound and constructive. However, in my opinion, we should not blame either ourselves or the Americans. The US ambassador to Hungary Mark Palmer, whom we knew already from Yurmala, started the discussion. The American tourists of Jewish origin supported his thoughts by presenting their concrete complaints. Essentially, there is nothing wrong with it, but such a view presented through a prism of strictly personal and deeply subjective feelings aroused antipathy among the participants. I remember the words said by our compatriot Karina Mierina: "One may think that the world has only one problem, that is, the problem of Jews". In Tbilisi, such issues, which were hotly discussed in Yurmala, namely, going abroad, emigration, and meetings, were not debated. However, regarding these issues, it was recalled that recently the American labor unions invited their partners from the USSR to visit, but the American authorities did not issue them visas. Mark Palmer tried to justify such actions by explaining that the authorities in charge of visas are overloaded. We were reproached that parcels mailed from abroad to the Soviet Union are subjected to an

extremely high customs duty, that they are slowly delivered and sometimes even disappear. We were also criticized for the fact that the Soviet Union cares very little for publishing religious literature. We recognize that these are real problems and that already in the nearest future these problems will be resolved.

[Pakalns] What was the impact of the presence of former U.S. ambassador to the USSR, Arthur Hartmann, at the conference?

[Gorbunov] A positive one. Mr. Hartmann represents those circles in the U.S. which contributed to improving the relations between our countries. At the present time, the former ambassador is retired and is involved in his business. In Tbilisi, Arthur Hartmann made an interesting and substantial speech. He stressed that in the nearest future, regardless of who is the next President, the American administration will have to be mainly involved with domestic rather than foreign problems. Arthur Hartmann condemned the USSR and the U.S practices of selling arms and did not support the American trade restrictions imposed on our country. We stressed that economic pressure cannot improve relations. In his opinion a unilateral placement of nuclear weapons in space would be regarded as a wrong decision. He also stated that the human rights should be guaranteed by each individual sovereignty. I am also ready to put my signature to these words of Arthur Hartmann.

[Pakalns] Comrade Gorbunov, all the time we have spoken only about important and serious problems of cooperation. But is it not true that at present any international meeting cannot be imagined to be without any not-so-serious and even amusing events.

[Gorbunov] Indeed, they do happen. Today, with a kind smile I would like to recollect several of such episodes. I cannot say that our Georgian friends, who received guests in their homes, were always successful organizers. However, these small mistakes were more than amply compensated by the traditional hospitality of the people, which this time was demonstrated on an especially large scale. Those one hundred and twenty Americans, who lived with Georgian families during the conference, fully experienced it. Of course, during their free time, the guests were offered a wide program of entertainment. The guests also visited the Tbilisi market. And here they experienced an unexpected surprise when people would not take money for the goods selected by the guests. I also remember with a smile certain aspects of the discussion. We noticed that when the discussion was about issues of a philosophical nature, mostly women were representing the Georgian side. However, when the subject was trade, only Georgian men were speaking. An American couple from Chicago, Becky and Fred Habimiht, celebrated their silver anniversary in the Tbilisi wedding palace. The celebration was colorful, festive, and unforgettable.

[Pakalns] Have we discussed only some aspects of the conference in Tbilisi?

[Gorbunov] I think that Ivars Vikis can provide a more detailed description of other problems

[Pakalns] Good. We will publish the conversation with Ivars Vikis in one of the next issues of CINA. Comrade Gorbunov, thank you!

BSSR CP CC Plenum Resolution Staffing Central Committee Commissions

*18000482 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 3 Jan 89 p 1*

[Resolution of the 22nd Plenum of the Central Committee of the Belorussian CP: "On Commissions within the Central Committee of the Belorussian CP"]

[Text] 1. To confirm commissions for the Belorussian CP Central Committee, composed of the following:

Commission on Questions of Organizational-Party and Cadres Operations

Sokolov, Ye. Ye.—First Secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, commission chairman.

Igrunov, N. S.—Second Secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, deputy chairman of the commission.

Commission members:

Boris, V. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, member of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, director of the department of organizational-party and cadres operations of the Belorussian CP Central Committee.

Voytsekhovskiy, V. A.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chancellor of the Minsk VPSH [Higher Party School].

Galko, V. G.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Minsk party gorkom.

Golovan, V. T.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chairman of the Commission on Party Control of the Belorussian CP Central Committee.

Demchuk, M. I.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, BSSR Minister of Public Education.

Kletskov, L. G.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Grodno party obkom.

Makalovich, I. P.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, editor of the newspaper ZVYAZDA.

Malofeyev, A. A.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, member of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Minsk party obkom.

Mikulich, V. A.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, Deputy Chairman of the Presidium of the BSSR Supreme Soviet.

Polyachenok, V. P.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, fitter at the Minsk PO [production organization] for the Production of Cutting and Broach Machine Tools imeni S. M. Kirov.

Radetskiy, Ye. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, second secretary of the Vitebsk party obkom.

Rosh, N. I.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, secretary of Belsovprof [Belorussian Trade Union Council].

Sayenko, A. P.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, second secretary of the Brest party obkom.

Selitskiy, V. S.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Mozyr party gorkom.

Fursov, V. P.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Mogilev party gorkom.

Ideological Commission

Pechennikov, V. A.—secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, commission chairman.

Mazay, N. N.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, Deputy Chairman of the BSSR Council of Ministers, deputy chairman of the commission.

Commission members:

Andreyev, A. Ye.—member of the revision commission of the Belorussian CP, chairman of the republic Council of War and Labor Veterans.

Buravkin, G. N.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, Chairman of the BSSR State Committee on Television and Radio.

Veselov, G. V.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, deputy director of forces for the Red Banner Western Frontier District of the USSR Committee on State Security.

Getmanchuk, V. N.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, deputy chairman of the ispolkom of the Brest Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

Grinev, N. F.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, second secretary of the Mogilev party obkom.

Zhebrak, M. V.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Volkovysk party gorkom.

Kamay, A. S.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Gomel party obkom.

Kovalevskiy, A. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, lathe operator at the Belorussian Automobile Plant.

Luchenok, I. M.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, administrative chairman of the BSSR Composers' Union.

Naumenko, I. Ya.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, Vice President of the BSSR Academy of Sciences.

Pavlov, S. Ye.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, director of the ideological department of the Belorussian CP Central Committee.

Skurko, Ye. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, administration chairman of the BSSR Writers' Union.

Chachin, V. N.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chancellor of the Belorussian Polytechnic Institute.

Chumanikhina, M. Ya.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, general director of the Dolomit PO of Vitebsk.

Yaskov, V. Ya.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Oktyabrsk party raykom in Minsk.

Commission on Socio-Economic Questions

Lepeshkin, V. A.—secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chairman of the commission.

Kebich, V. F.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, member of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, deputy chairman of the BSSR Council of Ministers, chairman of BSSR Gosplan, deputy chairman of the commission.

Commission members:

Aleshin, A. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Grodno party gorkom.

Bychek, A. N.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, second secretary of the Minsk party obkom.

Goncharik, V. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, candidate member of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chairman of Belsovprof.

Gulev, N. T.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, BSSR Minister of Light Industry.

Yevtukh, V. G.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, member of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the BSSR Council of Ministers.

Zelenovskiy, A. A.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Brest party obkom.

Kichkaylo, A. T.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chairman of the ispolkom of the Mogilev Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

Lavrinovich, M. F.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, general director of the Belorussian Association for the Production of Large-Capacity Trucks (BelavtoMAZ).

Makayed, N. A.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, deputy chairman of the BSSR Council of Ministers.

Makeychenko, B. A.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, director of the socio-economic department of the Belorussian CP Central Committee.

Mikhasev, V. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chairman of the ispolkom of the Minsk City Soviet of People's Deputies.

Rokhmanko, Ye. V.—instrument tester, Gomel.

Trutnev, A. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, deputy Chairman of the BSSR Council of Ministers.

Ulashchik, V. S.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, BSSR Minister of Health.

Ustin, N. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Dokshitskiy raykom of the Belorussian CP.

Commission on Agricultural Questions

Dementey, N. I.—secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, commission chairman.

Khusainov, Yu. M.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, member of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, First Deputy Chairman of the BSSR Council of Ministers, Chairman of BSSR Gosagroprom [State Agro-Industrial Committee], deputy commission chairman.

Commission members:

Bashkevich, S. A.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Orshanskiy party raykom.

Voytenkov, N. G.—director of the agricultural department of the Belorussian CP Central Committee.

Domenikan, N. V.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Baranovichskiy party raykom.

Dubko, A. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chairman of Progress Kolkhoz of Grodnenskiy Rayon.

Dutkovskaya, A. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, senior zootechnologist of Kolkhoz imeni V. I. Lenin of Berestovitskiy Rayon.

Yermolitskiy, V. S.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Shklovskiy party raykom.

Kulakov, V. P.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chairman of the ispolkom of the Vitebsk Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

Leonov, V. S.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Mogilev party obkom.

Nikitchenko, I. N.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, Deputy Chairman of BSSR Gosagroprom.

Plavskiy, I. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, director of Krasnaya Zvezda State Breeding Plant of Kletskiy Rayon.

Sanchukovskiy, V. A.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, second secretary of Gomel party obkom.

Titov, I. V.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, director of specialized construction in the Polesyevodstroy Association.

Tishkevich, A. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chairman of the ispolkom of the Minsk Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

Tolkach, L. K.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, editor of SELSKAYA GAZETA.

Commission on State Legal Questions

Igrunov, N. S.—Second Secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, commission chairman.

Baluyev, V. G.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, member of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, Chairman of the BSSR Committee on State Security, deputy commission chairman.

Commission members:

Goydenko, P. P.—candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, general director of Integral PO.

Grakhovskiy, A. A.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chairman of the ispolkom of the Gomel Oblast Soviet of Workers' Deputies.

Grigoryev, V. V.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Vitebsk party obkom.

Zinin, A. K.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, editor of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA.

Lagir, M. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, member of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, Chairman of the BSSR Committee of People's Control.

Martysyuk, A. P.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, chairman of the Minsk Oblast Trade Union Council.

Maslakova, R. V.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, rewinder at the Mogilev Plant of Artificial Fiber imeni V. V. Kuybyshev of Khimvolokno Production Association imeni V. I. Lenin.

Mikhelson, V. V.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, director of the state-legal department of the Vitebsk obkom of the Belorussian CP.

Moshko, I. G.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, second secretary of the Grodno party obkom.

Piskarev, V. A.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, BSSR Minister of Internal Affairs.

Platonov, V. P.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, President of the BSSR Academy of Sciences.

Starovoytov, V. K.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, Chairman of Rassvet Kolkhoz imeni K. P. Orlovskiy of Kirovskiy Rayon.

Slonov, A. V.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, first secretary of the Korelichskiy party raykom.

Shuralev, V. M.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, member of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, commander of the Belorussian military district.

Shatilo, B. I.—member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, BSSR Finance Minister.

2. The Plenum of the Belorussian CP Central Committee examines the development of the commission as an important measure in implementing the goals of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on the development of collective management and on attracting members and candidate members into the ranks of the Belorussian CP Central Committee on a regular basis for active work in the most important directions of party life.

In accordance with the resolution of the November 1988 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee the commission studies the problems in its area and draws up proposals to improve the operations of party committees and organizations and to implement the party's political aims. It analyzes how party resolutions are being carried out, implements the preliminary study of the most important questions and attracts for this purpose the party aktiv and leading scientists, specialists and public workers. Based on the results of its study it proposes draft documents to the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee or to the plenum of the central committee. The commission may develop practical recommendations for party committees and organizations as regards the forms and methods of work needed to implement party decisions and for organizational and ideological support.

By order of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee the commission provides assessments of drafts of resolutions and other documents dealing with the principle questions of socio-economic and public development of the republic.

3. Questions brought up for examination by the commission are collectively discussed at its meetings, which are held as necessary but no less often than once quarterly. Any member of the commission may demonstrate initiative in formulating questions. In its work the commission refers back to the corresponding departments of the Belorussian CP Central Committee. The commission may create work groups.

Organizational-technical conditions for the commission's work are determined by the general department and administration of affairs of the Belorussian CP Central Committee. The activities of the commission are interpreted by the means of mass information.

**Ambassador Yegorychev on Khrushchev
Dismissal, Brezhnev Appointment**

*18300395 Moscow OGONEK in Russian
No 6, 4-11 Feb 89 pp 6-7, 28-30*

[Interview with Nikolay Grigoryevich Yegorychev by
OGONEK special correspondent Leonid Pleshakov:
"Appointed Ambassador..."]

[Text] [Pleshakov] To start our conversation I asked Nikolay Grigoryevich to explain how he agreed to travel to Afghanistan as ambassador when he was already 68 years old. For in our days this is perhaps the most difficult country, both on the military-political plane and in all other aspects. And did his relief after only 7 months not mean that the decision was precipitate?

[Yegorychev] I regarded the proposal that I should go to Kabul as ambassador (and it was quite unexpected for me) as a special trust placed in me by the party central committee. During conversation with the leadership I even said that if they had asked me to go to a favorable country I probably would have refused, the more so since at that time my duties as first deputy chairman of the USSR Chamber of Trade and Commerce was keeping me fully engaged.

In Afghanistan time was, as it were, compressed. I worked the entire 7 months without a day off, 14 or 15 hours a day.

[Pleshakov] And the constant danger...

[Yegorychev] Yes, that too. I think that during that time we still managed to do something useful. In particular, the first 50,000 Soviet servicemen were withdrawn from the country before 15 August without a single casualty. However, the way in which the situation developed in Afghanistan after the Geneva agreement was reached unfortunately (and we were not to blame) was not a favorable path for the republic. And even though our country met all the requests of the Afghan leadership both with regard to reinforcing the defense capability of the Afghan armed forces and on the economic plane, life demanded active, including unusual diplomatic steps from our side to support a peaceful settlement to the Afghan problem. This was precisely how I evaluated the dispatch of first deputy foreign minister Yu.M. Vorontsov as ambassador to that country.

My activity in Kabul was assessed positively by the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Najibullah awarded me an Order of the April Revolution, and in his speech on that occasion described my sojourn in the Republic of Afghanistan in glowing terms.

So that I regard my work in that country as a worthy page on which to complete my labor before retiring. As far as

the difficulties were concerned, I belong to that category of people for whom life has been complicated but very interesting.

[Pleshakov] During our conversation, Nikolay Grigoryevich repeatedly made various references to "my generation," "on the shoulders of my generation," "my generation, cut down by war." In order to make this more understandable I asked him to tell me about himself.

Yegorychev is a Muscovite, born and bred. He was born in Strogino, a former village near Moscow that has now for a long time been one of the suburbs of the capital. His father died when Nikolay Grigoryevich was only 10 months old, leaving his mother with six children. They were poor and hungry. His mother died when he was 17. But his older sisters were already married and they helped their brother to finish 10-grade school. Exactly 50 years ago he enrolled at the Moscow Higher Technical School imeni Bauman; he wanted to become an engineer. When in the autumn of 1941 the Moscow Higher Technical School was evacuated to Izhevsk, 82 students at the school (Yegorychev included) volunteered for the No 3 Moscow Communist Division. His platoon of tank destroyers was dispatched to defend a bridge over the Moskva-Volga canal located on the Leningrad highway near the village of Khimki, close to his home. It was at that point that the Germans got closest to the capital, but they did not break through to the city.

After the defeat of the Germans at Moscow the division in which Yegorychev had fought was dispatched to the region of Seliger, where at that time fierce fighting was taking place. In the first fighting on 21 February all but 38 of the 138 men in his rifle company were casualties. Seventy were killed and 30 wounded. In this fighting the political instructor was seriously wounded and Yegorychev, still a member of the Komsomol, was appointed in his place. He was first enrolled as a party candidate member on 5 March 1942.

[Yegorychev] I remember, Nikolay Grigoryevich said, how right in the middle of a meeting of the party commission the command came: "Aux armes!" It turned out that the Germans had launched an attack. Even as I ran out I heard "There is a resolution to be decided" and a voice answering "Adopted!" That was how I became a party candidate member, but they did not manage to give me my party card; 3 days later I was wounded. By then only 5 of the 138 men who had come to Seliger remained.

[Pleshakov] In the summer after being released from the hospital he went back to the same region, but in another unit. There, in August he was accepted for a second time as a candidate.

And another few days later he was again wounded.

On his return from the hospital other battles were raging on that same Northwest Front. Then on the Kursk Bulge and in the forcing of the Dnepr near Pereyaslav-Khmel-nitskiy. Together with his First Ukrainians he attacked toward the West. When victory came he was in Dresden, and he was demobilized in Vienna with the rank of lieutenant in January 1946.

And straight back to Moscow to the Moscow Higher technical School.

He was reinstated on the fourth course. He was soon elected secretary of the faculty buro. A year later he became the Komsomol organizer for the Komsomol central committee of the entire VUZ. Then he was released as a party committee secretary.

[Yegorychev] I never had enough time, Yegorychev recalls. I got my diploma in fits and starts by working through the vacations. After that I decided to write a dissertation. In the evening after work in the party committee for one-and-a-half to 2 hours (and not every day, of course) I managed to get away to the laboratory. And somehow everything turned out all right.

And immediately I was sent for by the Moscow party gorkom, and they said: "We shall recommend you for the post of secretary of the Bauman party raykom." And so I explained that somehow I was trying to prepare my dissertation, but they said "You must." You know, that is how it was: "YOU MUST!" Eighteen months later, after the 20th Congress, I was elected raykom first secretary. I worked day and night in that post for 4 years and was confirmed a CPSU Central Committee inspector.

Early in 1961 they elected me second secretary of the Moscow party gorkom, and in November 1962, first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom.

[Pleshakov] You worked in that post until June 1967. I tell you candidly (I remember that time well), your departure was unexpected for many people. At that times affairs in the Moscow party organization seemed to be going well, no complications were looming, and even your removal from the post was not accompanied by antagonism preceding or following decrees, official explanations or "open" letters for the party aktiv, which was the practice at that time. True, there was no shortage of unofficial talk. But although, in accordance with our long-standing and tried and tested tradition they also usually contain enough information to think about, nevertheless they were not always accurate and logical. So that at the same time much was unclear about what had happened. Were you in conflict with Brezhnev?

[Yegorychev] There were no conflicts as such. We simply had differing views on methods and practice in party leadership. But again, these were not in the nature of

sharp contradictions. Everything was rather simpler and at the same time more complicated... It cannot be explained in just a few words.

Well then, how many words?... I understand, Nikolay Grigoryevich, that it is not especially pleasant for you to recall those events. But this was more than 20 years ago and as we know, time heals all wounds. This is the only reason that I am bold to ask you about this. And OGONEK readers want to get their information first hand. I think that they have this right...

[Yegorychev] As you say, with regard to the wounds, I felt none at the time nor later. For they did not remove me from the post. I myself, at my own initiative, stated that I was prepared to do any other kind of work. And now I am convinced all over again that I acted correctly at that time. Even though it was a very abrupt change in my life. A difficult change. For up to then I had been a party worker and I had to transfer to engineering administrative work. And it was at that time that I really was able to assess what the Moscow Higher Technical School had given me.

But in order to understand how all this came about we must go back to the time when Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev, with whom I had to work closely for some time, was still CPSU Central Committee First Secretary.

[Pleshakov] What was your opinion of him?

[Yegorychev] Nikita Sergeyevich was given much by nature. However, the trouble was that it also included the fact that he had not received a good formal education. This was exactly why he had an oversimplified understanding of certain complex phenomena. But typically, as an intelligent man he quickly grasped the essential nature of a question. Moreover, he was helped in his work by an enormous experience of life.

There is no doubt that he was a major party and state figure. However, before the 22nd Party Congress Khrushchev was one man, but after it he became quite different. Before the 22nd Congress (late 1961) it was possible to talk with him and resolve issues. He could listen to his interlocutor. At the congress Nikita Sergeyevich got very good support from an absolute majority of the delegates. And it seemed to me that he drew the wrong conclusions for himself. He overestimated himself. It was as if someone else had replaced him. He had too high an opinion of himself and thought that he knew everything. He considered his opinion infallible... and he began to concentrate all power in his own hands.

[Pleshakov] But of course the greatest support was given to Khrushchev by the party in the summer of 1957 when he was even removed from the post of party central committee first secretary by the Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich group...

[Yegorychev] They did not have the right to remove him since it was not they but the CPSU Central Committee that had appointed him. And the fact that the party was scandalized by this and condemned them shows once again that after the 20th Congress attitudes within our ranks were not what they had been previously. The party was on the upsurge. In its lower organizations there was very sharp discussion of the status of internal party affairs and a return was planned to the Leninist norms of party life. And when the Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich group tried again to return everything to the times and methods of Stalin, the party would not accept this turnaround. It was the right decision and Khrushchev was rightly supported.

When he became leader Nikita Sergeyevich did much that was useful and interesting in developing the country's national economy. For example, he promoted the introduction of reinforced concrete in production, making it possible to switch to industrial methods, including in housing construction. He provided impetus for the development of space exploration. The idea of the opening up of the virgin lands was his. Of course, today all of this can be disputed: whether or not his decisions were correct. Until quite recently many of Khrushchev's initiatives were being attributed to Brezhnev. But this is not what we are talking about. I say only that many of the initiatives of those years became a stage in the development of a particular sector of the economy, and of the entire country. The opening up of the virgin lands was a heroic campaign that perhaps should not have been done as it was, with so much noise, but then we could at least feed the country. For in Khrushchev's times we bought virtually no grain from abroad.

He has been criticized about the corn. But now it occupies a firm place in grain production, particularly for silage. He is abused for his ugly five-story apartment buildings. But in Khrushchev's times they were the only possible way to provide incentive in resolving the housing problem.

What was bad about Khrushchev was that he was a man of extreme opinions. If it was reinforced concrete, then no other construction materials were needed, not even brick. If it was corn, then rid the fields of oats, sown grasses and other fodder crops. If we develop chemicals then it is at the cost of metallurgy.

And in international affairs he conducted himself not in the best fashion: he complicated relations with the United States and with the PRC, he broke with Albania, and to some extent urged on the arms race. And what was the point of this "one-upmanship" with which we started to frighten the world...

[Pleshakov] Do you see any objective reason for this metamorphosis of Khrushchev's personality?

[Yegorychev] In my opinion, it all happened because after the 20th Congress we failed to consolidate everything that had been achieved in the struggle against personality cult. Even Khrushchev, the initiator and leader of that struggle, while continuing to carry the burden of personality cult, himself to some degree moved away from it, was amenable to flattery, and displayed a weakness for high awards. The road to the "stars" [Orders of Lenin] was opened up for Brezhnev by the example of Khrushchev. For he himself had four and Leonid Ilich made it five. By October 1964 Khrushchev's voluntarism had started to put the brakes on our advance.

[Pleshakov] What do you have in mind, from your own personal experience?

[Yegorychev] Well, for example, the idea of eliminating private subsidiary farms in the countryside. He started to run ahead with this, reckoning that questions concerning the production of food products had already been completely resolved and that it was possible to switch to more productive labor on large farms and totally eliminate the small ones, where there was large-scale use of manual labor, where output was expensive and so forth. And in this way we lost a source for providing the country with meat and milk.

Or take another example. In the last years he made relations with the USSR Academy of Sciences very complicated. At one CPSU Central Committee plenum in 1964 he even tossed out the remark that this, he said, was the kind of Academy of Sciences that the tsar would want, but that we did not need it. A great deal of work was needed to persuade M.V. Keldysh, who was at that time the president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, not to resign.

Nikita Sergeyevich tried to transfer the Timiryazevskiy Institute into the countryside, which, I think, was a very wrong decision. When a young person goes to the Timiryazevskiy from the countryside into Moscow this is an education for him and it is not only the VUZ that teaches him but also the capital itself, the largest cultural center in the country. To transfer an academy to somewhere four hundred or five hundred versts from the capital meant depriving the students of all that. And the teaching staff would not go into the countryside. To be candid, at that time virtually everyone who had anything to do with the resolution of this question simply engaged in sabotage. And the city party organization did everything possible to enable the Timiryazevskiy Institute to remain in Moscow.

Then do you remember the cadre reshuffling? Some pleased Nikita Sergeyevich, some did not. The former were brought in, the latter sent out. Or N.S. Khrushchev's unfortunate meeting with the creative intelligentsia in Moscow... At that time we in the Moscow leadership had to withstand a strong pressure from the top to prevent reprisals against those whom Nikita Sergeyevich

criticized at those meetings. Yes, there was a great deal of this. In any event, after the 22nd Congress our leader changed sharply for the worse. And the most serious problem was that he did not stand the test of power and in fact started to move away from collective leadership methods and failed to cut short the glorification that became increasingly unrestrained toward him. The press became Khrushchev's patrimony. It became clear that a new cult was gaining strength. It was therefore quite logical and sound that at the Central Committee October (1964) Plenum Khrushchev was removed from the post of first secretary.

[Pleshakov] Several pieces have recently been published in the press, including OGONEK in particular, in which Khrushchev's removal from his high posts has been evaluated as a coup effected by the Brezhnev group, a coup that occurred not spontaneously but was prepared in a planned way over a quite long period of time, and that the role of each participant in this "plot" (this word is also being used in these recollections) was determined ahead of time, and that each person knew with whom he should speak and who should be convinced to vote against Khrushchev at the plenum...

[Yegorychev] Yes, I have read these recollections.... What can I say? It was not at all a "plot" against Khrushchev but the fact that he brought about his own dismissal, and that the central committee elected at the 22nd Congress found itself strong enough to remove him as first secretary before his errors could grow. But of course, the plenum had to prepare for this and it was not a simple matter and to some extent even dangerous. However, a majority of the members of the central committee were inwardly ready for the discussion, and was I personally convinced of this when on the eve of the plenum I talked with central committee members Keldysh, Yelyutin, Kozhevnikov, Kostousov and some others. I can only add that in early October Brezhnev himself began to be frightened when he found out that Khrushchev was in possession of certain information on this matter, and he in no way wanted to return from the GDR, where he was leading a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Pleshakov] Do you remember what happened?

[Yegorychev] Of course. In early October Nikita Sergeyevich went on a vacation to Pitsunda, from where he called Moscow before the plenum met. At a meeting of the Central Committee Presidium they talked candidly to him about the errors that he had permitted and reported that the question of his removal would be raised for resolution at the plenum. After listening to the claims made against him, Nikita Sergeyevich made no special efforts to dispute the criticism directed at him. Convinced that a majority of those present who had spoken were against him, he issued a statement of resignation from the post of First Secretary. By that time the

members of the central committee had started to assemble in Moscow. On 14 October the plenum took place at which Khrushchev was relieved, as it said in the resolution, "in connection with his advanced age and for reasons of health."

He himself was present at the plenum but he did not speak. His statement was simply read out, Suslov presented the report, and the question was put to the vote...

[Pleshakov] Did anyone speak after that?

[Yegorychev] No, no one.

[Pleshakov] Strange. So many claims were being made against Khrushchev and suddenly no one wanted to express then openly...

[Yegorychev] I think that many people did want to. I, for example, was prepared to speak. But right before the plenum Brezhnev, who at that time was a central committee second secretary, telephoned me and said: "We have all been talking this over and we think that there will be no need to open it up for discussion. Khrushchev has issued a statement. What would there be to gain by this? It will be better to discuss all issues thoroughly at the regular plenums, and you know that those who most need criticizing will be the first to slide up onto the dais..."

[Pleshakov] In what sense?

[Yegorychev] You know there is a category of people who very much "love" command, and as soon as a leader loses his post they are the first to start throwing mud, currying favor with the new leader...

I remember that I asked Brezhnev: "And what do the others think?"

"They are saying that we can manage without the speeches." "Fine," I agreed. "But if it does become necessary, I am ready to speak." I had the main thoughts of my statement ready.

[Pleshakov] Notwithstanding, Nikolay Grigoryevich, the situation was somewhat unexpected: the party leader is removed from the post that he has occupied for 11 years. Many claims are being made against that leader for his subjectivism, voluntarism and so forth. And suddenly, those who now have an opportunity to speak about these claims decide to remain silent. I understand that it is not very pretty to criticize a leader who is already overthrown, when you will not be persecuted for voicing the criticism. The Chinese say that there is no need to be a hero to grab a dead tiger by the tail. But by criticizing Khrushchev it would have been possible to speak not so much against Nikita Sergeyevich as against the system of relations that had enabled his subjectivism and voluntarism to flourish and that led to a new cult.

[Yegorychev] It is difficult to argue with this. But you say this 24 years after the October Plenum when we now know where the 18 years of Brezhnev's rule led the country, and when we know about his failures in domestic and foreign policy and the corruption and moral degradation of a number of those close to Leonid Ilich. But then, in the fall of 1964, we truly believed in the probity of Brezhnev and the people close to him, and that those people were guided only by high party interests and wanted the good of the party and the country. That is how I thought. Now I understand that I was naive and that Brezhnev was pursuing but one goal—to take Khrushchev's place. But that became clear later. And it cost the party and the country dearly. Of course, each of us, the members of the central committee, bears responsibility for the development of events that led to stagnation.

Now, after so many years, it is also clear that Brezhnev had a reason for being against speeches at the plenum. During the discussion, in the heat of the moment much might have been said that would subsequently have been associated with him. And obviously Leonid Ilich already had other plans in his head.

[Pleshakov] Nikolay Grigoryevich, you will probably say again that I am approaching the events of that time using today's yardstick, but I have always been astonished that Brezhnev was chosen as the party leader. For he had no special merit or authority to be elected to such a high post.

[Yegorychev] Leonid Ilich—a leader? He was never a leader, either before or after the October Plenum. It just so happened that when Khrushchev was removed there simply was no other candidate worthy of the high post. Within a narrow circle of friends I used to say "Brezhnev will not last."

[Pleshakov] And who, in your opinion, could have "lasted"?

[Yegorychev] I named Kosygin. They said to me: "Kosygin is an administrator, a manager, not a party figure." "On the other hand, I said, "he is one of the most senior members in the party leadership and thus he has great experience in party and state work."

I think that at the time I was right...

[Pleshakov] All right, Nikolay Grigoryevich, you spoke in favor of Kosygin to your circle of friends. But why did you not speak at the plenum and propose him?

[Yegorychev] Of course that would have been possible. But at the time I did not know Brezhnev very well, and they convinced me that he was not weaker than Kosygin. Moreover, I was also proceeding from the assumption that the most important thing was not whether it was Kosygin or Brezhnev who would be first secretary but that in its work the central committee leadership should

adhere strictly to the Leninist principles of collective leadership. In addition I was convinced that most members of the central committee with whom I had dealings favored Brezhnev. For outwardly he tried to be a very charming man. Even now many people think that he was some kind of good fellow, even though in fact he was not.

[Pleshakov] I think that there have been cases in which for the good of the matter it has been necessary to go against the majority...

[Yegorychev] I agree that such cases do exist, but at that specific moment I was perhaps the only one who had any doubts about Brezhnev's nomination. Incidentally, Brezhnev found out about this: "You support Nikolay, but he spoke against you."

[Pleshakov] Who told him?

[Yegorychev] Who is not important. I know and that is enough. In any case, knowing a thing and proving it are two different things.

[Pleshakov] And do you still happen to meet this man ever?

[Yegorychev] I have.

[Pleshakov] So it turns out that Brezhnev waited for about 3 years for an appropriate moment to remind you of your negative attitude toward his nomination?

[Yegorychev] I think that he had other things to recall apart from that fact. But at the October 1964 Plenum what united the members of the central committee was the general criticism of Khrushchev's mistakes and shortcomings, and his retreat from the ideas of the 20th and 22nd party congresses, which, as we could all see, had hampered our advance.

And at that time it was difficult to suggest that the goals of people striving to restore the Leninist principles of leadership, and the goals of Brezhnev himself and of his closest entourage did not coincide. But when Leonid Ilich assumed power and started to choose his entire "team," only then did these divergences start to appear.

It should be said that personally I had quite good relations with him at first. I met him often and expressed my own proposals and made my own comments, and even my disagreement with some things. And he used to listen, and sometimes he offered advice. But at some moment I evidently began to bother him, and perhaps even started to interfere...

[Pleshakov] Some people think that Brezhnev was a figurehead for those around him, who by advancing him and exalting him, advanced themselves...

[Yegorychev] I do not think that that he was any kind of figurehead. That he relied on people who were his match—not particularly deep but especially conscientious in their work—is another matter. Taking advantage of the license granted them, some of them sank lower and lower. He wanted to gain authority for himself quickly and easily. To this end he immediately proposed pay increases for a whole series of categories of workers. Wages were increased but he still had to offer some kind of goods for sale. And consumer goods and services were not being provided in the volumes required, and the excess of money had to be somehow covered. They started to increase the production of vodka and cheap beer. This was a very dangerous path. The enormous amounts of money now built up in the savings banks or that the public have are the direct consequence of this ill-considered policy. Drunkenness and alcoholism, which developed so rapidly during the period of stagnation, are also the result.

[Pleshakov] But as I understood you there were also other ideas and proposals after the Central Committee October (1964) Plenum, were there not?

[Yegorychev] Of course. And they were expressed by the delegates to the 23rd Party Congress. In particular, by myself personally. At that time I had to speak first in the discussions. And Brezhnev very much wanted my speech to answer in full the proposals in his report, for example, that questions of personality cult not be raised. Even though the whole world knew that after the 20th and 22nd party congresses our new forum would confirm the immutability of the CPSU's course toward overcoming the consequences of the cult. When Leonid Ilich printed the final version of the report he sent me three or four copies direct from the printing machine, page by page, to the gorkom [saying]: "Nikolay, have a look and see what you think."

[Pleshakov] You were on intimate first-name terms?

[Yegorychev] He used the familiar form of address to me, while I used the formal mode of address; in any case, there was an age difference of 14 years... So anyway, he sent me the pages of his report and I understood perfectly that this was not because he was interested in my opinion but so that in my speech I would take that report into account and not say anything that he did not want.

[Pleshakov] And did you include this in your speech?

[Yegorychev] No. I nevertheless did say (permit me to read from the stenographic record): "Personality cult and violation of the Leninist norms and principles of party life and of socialist legality—everything that hampered our advance—have been decisively discarded by the party and there will never be a return to that past! The reliable guarantee of this will be the course of the 20th Party Congress and the CPSU Central Committee October Plenum."

I knew that I was going against the line that Brezhnev had planned...

[Pleshakov] Although in one sense you were praising the decisions of the October Plenum, which elected him to the post of First Secretary...

[Yegorychev] Yes, even though I was praising the plenum decisions. And it did not go unremarked. On the following day I received the TASS materials and and I saw that all over the world the reports of the congress had focused their attention primarily on that paragraph from my speech. Leonid Ilich said nothing to me about it but I could sense that he was very angry.

[Pleshakov] But that was not everything in your speech...

[Yegorychev] Of course, there were also other factors... I recalled that at the time when we were creating industry the party had advanced two slogans: "Technology Will Solve Everything" and "Cadres Who Have Mastered Technology Are Solving Everything." The slogans were correct and useful but at some stage there had been an underestimation of the Marxist-Leninist tenet that the exceptionally high rates in the development of production forces under socialism should be matched with improvements in production relations, and that although the socialist method of production was the first in history to create all the conditions necessary for this match it did not, of course, act automatically. The Marxist-Leninist understanding of the role of science requires first and foremost in-depth theoretical study and generalization of the very complex processes taking place in our country's economy. And the fact that our production forces had outstripped production relations was already being felt.

After my speech Academician P.N. Fedoseyev rebuked me for having, he said, taken up the issue that was not mine.

"Yes," I said, "it is not a question for me and I am not about to become involved in it, but as a practical man I feel that underestimation of this tenet is hampering us today in our advance. And it is to be hoped that the scholars will rake it up and study it and offer us recommendations..." However, that did not happen, and this was shown in M.S. Gorbachev's report to the 27th CPSU Congress.

[Pleshakov] Speaking candidly, Nikolay Grigoryevich, I do not see anything criminal in your speech. I cannot understand that anything there would not please Leonid Ilich.

[Yegorychev] Of course there was nothing criminal. But you see, reminding him of the personality cult did not please, nor could he have been pleased by the discussion on the shortcomings in economics, in the organization of production and the management of socialist enterprises,

and in training for leading cadres and so forth. My speech somehow fell short of the planned trend toward extreme glorification of our successes.

[Pleshakov] Did you feel that they remained dissatisfied with your speech?

[Yegorychev] Yes, and they let me know that. After the congress relations with Brezhnev took a turn for the worse. And even from early 1967 he in general tried not to receive me. Once as if by chance he suggested that I move across to the Ministry of Internal Affairs as deputy minister, but I refused, making reference to the fact that I was not a specialist.

I had two choices: go with the current, led by Brezhnev and probably participate successfully in sociopolitical activity, or remain by myself. I chose the latter path, which was difficult, but to make up for that my conscience remained clear.

[Pleshakov] Well, and...?

[Yegorychev] At the CPSU Central Committee June (1967) Plenum I spoke out very critically. As you know, there were two questions on the agenda then: the policy of the Soviet Union in connection with the Israeli aggression in the Near East, and the theses for the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The plenum lasted 2 days. I spoke on the first day, somewhere in the middle...

[Pleshakov] I have heard much gossip about your speech but I have never read it...

[Yegorychev] We traditionally publish information reports on the plenums and the main report. Not the reports of those who participate in its discussion. But I have kept my speech. Now that it is not a secret I can read some of the points made in it.

[Pleshakov] Nikolay Grigoryevich took from his desk a pile of sheets of half-size typing paper (probably because it was more convenient to put them in his pocket that way before he mounted the dais), leafed through them and found the place...

[Yegorychev] Listen to what I said at that time:

"Events in the Near East have evoked certain unhealthy attitudes among the most backward part of our population. I am talking primarily about the disgusting phenomena of Zionism and anti-Semitism. In order to prevent them from developing further we should not pass over them today as if we do not notice them. For unhealthy manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism in whatever form are very dangerous. Vladimir Ilich Lenin always paid great attention to the national question. Now, with the development of our socialist, multinational state, relations between the nations are becoming richer and more diverse. Sometimes some complex

phenomena emerge in these relations, particularly under conditions of the intensified ideological struggle between the two world systems. Thus, the national question is a living process in social development. And it can hardly be right that for some decades no work has been done on them, in all their diversity. Most often the matter is limited to the theme of friendship between the peoples of our country. Yes, the friendship of the peoples is a very great achievement of the party's Leninist national policy. At the same time, in-depth theoretical research on the national question in general can be very useful, particularly for us, the party practical workers..."

[Pleshakov] Nikolay Grigoryevich, you said this 21 years ago and yet it sounds so contemporary. But at that time were not the problems that have emerged so sharply today not being felt then?

[Yegorychev] Yes, even in those years interethnic relations in our country were becoming complicated but we continued to pretend that everything was in order...

[Pleshakov] How was this seen specifically? Can you cite some facts?

[Yegorychev] You see, the main thing here lay not in facts but rather in the general tone, particularly as it affected national culture and native language. And obviously, there was a basis for such attitudes and we had to analyze it, not drive the disease underground. In some republics there were complications in cadre policy, and relations deteriorated to some extent between the local nationalities and the Russian population. It cannot be said that this friction was strong or that things had reached a stage of open conflict, but in our practical work we had started to sense them, and this worried us...

Neither could I remain silent about a matter that still worried me. I said: "Serious harm has been inflicted on our cause in connection with the Stalin personality cult. The party has overcome this abnormal phenomenon, a phenomenon alien to the spirit of Lenin. The October 1964 Plenum was of enormous importance in the life of the party. The central committee unanimously condemned the voluntarist methods and subjectivism of Khrushchev, who in the latter period of his activity moved away from Leninist norms and principles of leadership and attempted to command the party and rule the country like an autocrat... And our enemies should take no comfort from this. No matter how they try to depict our difficulties as vices or to exaggerate our mistakes and shortcomings in practical work, in its struggle against the difficulties the CPSU has only gained strength and achieved even greater authority among the people and in the world communist and workers' movement. For the party is not only and not so much a Stalin or a Khrushchev. It is the millions of communist Leninists, our multithousand-strong, remarkable party aktiv, devoted to the cause, and it is, finally, our CPSU Central Committee."

And this was the reminder and it was assessed as a warning against new errors. The plenum was hushed, understanding at whom it was directed.

It could not please Brezhnev. He wanted to forget any reminder of personality cult and its condemnation. Because already by 1967 a tendency to exalt Leonid Ilich could already be seen...

[Pleshakov] The June 1967 plenum took place 10 days or so after the so-called "six-day war," in which the Israeli military inflicted a cruel defeat on our friends Egypt and Syria. And throughout the world this was assessed as a major political failure for us in the Near East. It was not happenstance that this question was included on the plenum agenda, and many speakers touched on it in their speeches. They say that you spoke the most sharply on this matter. I think that probably those directly involved in pursuing our policy, and first and foremost Brezhnev, could have regarded your words as criticism directed at them.

[Yegorychev] In fact I did deal with the subject... In April 1967 I had been in Egypt for 10 days as head of a Soviet delegation. Even so short a visit was enough to convince me that our ideas about the situation in that country differed widely from the true state of affairs, and that the question of "Who Whom" had still not been resolved in Egypt. Naturally, I could not share these observations in my speech. I shall not repeat everything that was said, but let me read you a fragment... Here, for example: "At the present time Nasir leads the most progressive forces in the United Arab Republic. His retirement would in fact signify a blow to leftist forces in the country and to the progressive transformations that are being made in the UAR, and it would signify a victory for the rightists, who have an obviously pro-Western orientation. Therefore, the line of the CPSU Central Committee aimed at strengthening and supporting the Nasir regime, restoring the fairly well shattered authority of the UAR in the Arab world, helping Arab countries to overcome the differences between them, strengthening their position in the Near East, uniting all forces in the struggle against imperialism, and strengthening the defense capabilities of the Arab states, is the only correct line, and it is finding support not only in our party and our country but also among all progressive forces in the world.

"Here, proceeding from the facts cited by comrade Brezhnev in his report, I would like to express the desire that in our relations with the UAR and with President Nasir personally, we should show a little more exactingness in providing aid for that country. Some of our friends are often very careless and irresponsible... What is the value, for example, of President Nasir's irresponsible statements that the Arabs will never agree to coexist with Israel, and about total war by the Arabs against that country, or the statement made on Cairo Radio on the first day of the war to the effect that at last the Egyptian

people were giving Israel a lesson in death. This kind of irresponsibility combined with lack of concern can lead the world to even more serious consequences."

[Pleshakov] The rumors also ascribed to you the phrase "in helping our friends we are prepared to give them the last shirt off our backs but they do not know how to wear it..."

[Yegorychev] No. I never said that.

[Pleshakov] They also assert that you criticized the status of our air defenses. Were you familiar with those installations?

[Yegorychev] I knew the positions of the Moscow air defense installations like the back of my own hand, as they say, so I knew the state of affairs not from reports, subordinates or interested persons, but saw them for myself. Now, 21 years later, when this is no longer a secret, I can say that at time the capital's air defense was unreliable... Before the CPSU Central Committee October (1964) Plenum arbitrary decisions were being made that damaged the Armed Forces, particularly the Air Force, the Navy and to some extent the mechanized troops. And incidentally, at that time there were no zealous executors for these arbitrary decisions. The navy was growing old, so cut the ships. We do not need an Air Force, so switch some of the aircraft factories to produce something else. It was precisely in those years that a helicopter plant in Moscow was closed. I therefore said in my speech: "Perhaps I am overemphasizing the issue and that I am incorrect in some things because of my lack of information. But I do believe that the country's defense is too important a matter, and therefore if we here in the central committee were to overemphasize an issue it would be only for the good of things... I am worried, for example, about the status of the capital's air defenses. The present system is becoming increasingly obsolete. Modernization will not produce the effect required. The development of a new air defense system for the capital is too slow..."

Most of all the comrades from the central committee leadership were very displeased with my proposal: "Perhaps it is time as we continue the line of the Central Committee October 1964 Plenum to hear a report at one of the upcoming plenums, in closed session, about the status of the country's defense and the tasks for party organizations, civilian and military." My proposal could have been regarded as an attempt to downgrade the role of the Politburo and bring its activity under the control of the central committee, which in general would be in line with the CPSU Rules and would prevent the kind of hasty decisions as, for example, the entry of Soviet forces into Afghanistan.

In short, the speech was also quite sharp in that section. It must be said that the plenum listened to my speech very attentively and with approval.

[Pleshakov] But evidently someone was not pleased?

[Yegorychev] It greatly offended Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov. He was at that time a central committee secretary and he oversaw the defense industry. And my criticism was also aimed at the distortions that were being permitted in the defense industry.

[Pleshakov] But I think that Brezhnev, too, had cause for offense: as chairman of the Defense Council he carried personal responsibility, particularly for Moscow's air defense... How did things develop after that?

[Yegorychev] Another three people spoke after me that day, and none of them uttered a single word of criticism either about me or my ideas. On that day the plenum meeting was adjourned half an hour before the intended time. I knew that before the following session certain work had to be done with the members of the central committee, and when on the following day Sharaf Rashidov mounted the rostrum, he started approximately thus: "Nikolay Grigoryevich, air defense does not begin in Moscow, it begins in Tashkent." And so on. Mzhavanadze (from Georgia), Katushev (Gorkiy) and Akhundov (Azerbaijan) spoke in the same spirit, even though they were unaware of the state of Moscow's air defenses.

And I sat and thought: "When in 1941 the enemy approached the gates of the capital then full responsibility for the defense of Moscow was laid on the shoulders of the Muscovites. Of course, the entire country helped us, but it was with my own comrades, not with Rashidov, that I sat in the foxhole by the bridge over the canal, with the Molotov cocktails and the grenades, waiting for the German tanks..."

I tell you honestly, it was not very pleasant to listen to all that...

[Pleshakov] What happened next?

[Yegorychev] Then events became extremely simple. On the next day after the plenum I went to Brezhnev and said: "I understand that it is possible to lead the Moscow party organization only if one has the support of the Politburo and party leadership. I understand that that support has been withdrawn. I therefore request your agreement to my departure." Brezhnev said: "You are dramatizing things for nothing. Think it over until tomorrow." But in fact I did not need that day; Brezhnev did because on his instructions work with the party aktiv was already under way.

On the following day I again went to him. He asked: "Well? Did you sleep on it?" "Yes I did," I replied, "And what did you decide?" "I told you yesterday what I had decided." "Well, all right. Do you have any requests?" "Just one: I must work." "Don't worry, there will be work for you..."

[Pleshakov] He was satisfied, was he not, that you yourself had untied his hands in this quite ticklish situation?

[Yegorychev] He probably was... I think that he was rather afraid that the Moscow party organization would not accept my resignation. But I assured him that everything would be fine and that there would be no excesses. The Moscow party organization would not bring any dissension to party unity. And I also understood that Brezhnev had the trust of the entire party. It was his time. And if disagreements had arisen in our relations, then it was I who must go. And the future would show who was right. And in fact the Moscow Gorkom plenum made no fuss and everything went off quietly. Those present included Suslov, Kapitonov and Grishin. Suslov spoke, saying that since comrade Yegorychev had requested that he be released from his duties as First Secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, that the central committee had acceded to his request, and in connection with this and with his transfer to other work, he proposed that he be so released. Suslov went on to talk about Grishin, proposing that he should replace me. He never said a word about the central committee plenum that had just ended, nor about my speech at that plenum. And I was not given the floor even though I had a statement ready, in which I would have said why in the conditions that had arisen I could not stay on as First Secretary of the Moscow Gorkom. Obviously that had also upset Leonid Ilich and so it was decided "from the top" that our city plenum would make its decision without discussion...

[Pleshakov] Forgive me, Nikolay Grigoryevich, but I have obviously failed to understand something. What a strange situation. Brezhnev and his entourage remained dissatisfied with your plenum speech. But why? It was necessary to show that they were right. But you suddenly voluntarily, without coercion, offer your resignation. And your work comrades, the members of the Moscow Party Gorkom, with no explanation from you, and with no discussion of the matter, accept this resignation. It seems the more strange to me because during that period the Moscow party organization had achieved notable successes. As I recall (I have had occasion to write about this) during the first 5 months of 1967 the volume of industrial production in Moscow rose 7.2 percent and labor productivity rose 6.9 percent compared with the same period in the previous year. The range of output produced had started to be renewed at accelerated rates. The new IL-62 and TU-154 airliners, designed in Moscow design bureaus, appeared, and a new range of machine tools, television sets and electric motors was being produced. The annual saving from improved product quality was great—hundreds of millions of rubles. The capital had at that time stopped importing manpower, and abandoned the so-called "allocations"—the streams of people coming in in past years that had given rise to very complex problems... That is, Moscow was on the upsurge.

How can we square all this? How can we understand it? As the latest model of democratic centralism and party discipline? For it was this kind of lack of opposition to evil that led us to the era of stagnation...

Ultimately, I am sure, there were other like-thinkers who would have supported you at that plenum and after it.

Or am I wrong?

[Yegorychev] Unfortunately, at that moment it was impossible to do what you are talking about. You must understand that what we are now observing is a somewhat mitigated and superficial approach to the complex process that ultimately led us into stagnation. Everything was much more complicated.

The methods of leadership that characterized Brezhnev's times did not take shape suddenly, immediately. They grew into our lives gradually, just like gradually a leadership nucleus was formed around Leonid Ilich that unconditionally supported him in everything. It was impossible to break through their closed ranks with any new ideas, even less criticisms. Just recall the economic reform of 1965. Proposed by Kosygin, it was supported in the party and people. But gradually, and then quite quickly, it came to nothing. In words everything was still moving ahead but in facts the brakes were being applied everywhere. When Brezhnev had created a reliable entourage and felt the full measure of his strength, he tied the hands of the Council of Ministers, of Kosygin, and ultimately achieved the appointment of N.A. Tikhonov as chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, a man who was devoted to him personally but not competent enough for so high a post. I recall that before the 1967 Plenum I said to one of our writers: "I have the feeling that we have started to move across the stream of life and are trying to stop it. This cannot be done. The flood will drown us. We must stand at the head of this movement and direct it into the proper channel." And these "seditious thoughts" of mine were conveyed to Brezhnev.

[Pleshakov] Nikolay Grigoryevich, why at that time, at the June Plenum, did you not speak of this? I think that your speech was quite sharp. But to be candid, you dealt with matters that were rather the consequence of the position of the party and the country in the summer of 1967...

[Yegorychev] You are right. But I was hoping that I would have an opportunity to speak at another plenum...

[Pleshakov] But they could simply not allow you to speak...

[Yegorychev] They would have if I had remained as First Secretary of the CPSU Moscow Gorkom. I believed that I had more time left...

But there were also other circumstances that for some reason are now not taken into account, even though they were very important. Brezhnev and his entourage and I with people who supported at least some of my views belonged to different generations. My contemporaries had not participated in the revolution. We were the first generation to have been born in Soviet times. But we had been reared, if I may express it in this way, on the yeast of the revolution. Our teachers had been people who had taken part in the revolution and the civil war, and they had been the active creators of those events. For example, when she had been 18 years old my class leader had worked in the political directorate of the 1st Cavalry Army. My physics teacher had been a regimental commander during the civil war. And when it had ended he did not shed his military uniform; he came to class in his field shirt and riding breeches. They were outstanding teachers and remarkable indoctrinators. Through them we imbibed the ideas of the revolution. We did not personally take part in the collectivization and industrialization of the country but it all took place right there before our eyes.

Our generation lived through 1937 and 1938 and we witnessed the events so tragic for the country, but our hands were clean. Our generation was the first after the revolution to be genuinely educated. But this was a generation cut down by war.

[Pleshakov] After the war it was calculated that of each 100 young soldiers born in the early twenties only 3 came home from the front.

[Yegorychev] Yes, our generation moved quite unnoticed in the political life of the country. If it had not been cut down by the war it could have picked up the baton from its predecessors and passed it on to those who followed. Unfortunately, however, we were unable to do that.

[Pleshakov] Nevertheless... If we look at it carefully the gap between your generation and the preceding one was still not so great. They—your predecessors—also came back from the front as heroes and victors. Yes, and the conditions for activity were more favorable than, say, before the war. For during the Brezhnev period, let's be honest, there were none of the repressions or cruel terror as under Stalin. But lack of initiative, slowdown, corruption, bribery, nepotism, drunkenness and the desire to live off someone else or off the state continually increased...

[Yegorychev] You know, the time of Stalin destroyed a significant proportion of leading workers and it crippled those who remained. I think that this was the greatest harm done to the country and people by the personality cult. And the period following the 20th Congress was too short to re-indoctrinate cadres and restore democracy and glasnost.

[Pleshakov] But even then there were many people in the leadership who were young and who thought in a new way...

[Yegorychev] Unfortunately, there were only a few of them. And they were quickly eliminated. Some went to work in some remote oblast, others were sent on diplomatic work in Africa, Australia, Europe and the Americas. We hampered Brezhnev and he wanted around himself only those who supported him unquestioningly, those who pleased him. For example, people close to Brezhnev told me on more than one occasion that it was essential to raise the authority of Leonid Ilich. I always answered thus: "I am in favor of raising the authority of the General Secretary, but in deeds. There is no need to puff him up, that harms both the party and Brezhnev personally, and this I shall not do." And my opinion was known to Brezhnev.

[Pleshakov] And you felt at that time that his authority had started to swell not out of merit. More accurately, this had started to appear already, not just in the latter years of his life when glorification of our leader and his endless decorations started to produce the opposite effect: his popularity declined increasingly.

[Yegorychev] Yes, he always loved flattery and glorification.

[Pleshakov] Was there really nothing to be done in the early days, when stagnation and all its concomitant phenomena had not yet started to flourish so luxuriantly?

[Yegorychev] The complexity of the situation was such that the negative processes were not immediately seen. The country was moving ahead, the national economy was developing. And although the rates of this advance slowed and although it was obvious to everyone that we would not fulfill our plans, few guessed who and what were the cause of the slowdown. I am sure that the obkom and kraykom secretaries working successfully at the local level and completely absorbed in resolving their own local problems would simply have been astonished to see me hurling accusations at Leonid Ilich personally. They would have said that I was not right and that no one was hampering their work!

Particularly if you take into account the fact that if he had wanted to Brezhnev could have left a positive opinion about himself. He was always able to receive an oblast secretary, talk with him in simple terms, promise help, tap him on the shoulder when they parted. We are all people, and you will agree that when the General Secretary of the Central Committee taps you in a friendly way on the shoulder or himself telephones you there in the oblast and calmly talks with you, it is a pleasant thing and evokes a sympathetic feeling. And to assert that such a fine and accessible man could be mistaken or conduct himself in a nonparty way—impossible...

So that my sharper statement at that plenum did nothing. Time was needed for people to have their eyes opened.

[Pleshakov] But by the time that many did have their eyes opened the situation had changed so much that it was impossible... Of course, Nikolay Grigoryevich, I may well be mistaken, because I do not have 20 years of work in the party apparatus behind me, as you do, but it seems to me that battle should have been joined way back in June 1967. It may not have led to victory but at least it would have forced people to think and perhaps hastened the enlightenment of others...

[Yegorychev] I am not sure... In addition, I was still hoping that I had another plenum in reserve, as they say, where it would be possible to continue the conversation that had been started.

[Pleshakov] You will agree, I think, that stagnation as a phenomenon did nevertheless have its own beginning. Of course, it developed little by little and there was a quantitative buildup of those elements that at one "wonderful" moment started to operate and imparted a new quality to the situation. For all those "zones outside criticism" and "persons beyond criticism" did not suddenly come into being. When do you think they did?

[Yegorychev] I think that before 1970 this process was taking place almost unnoticed. And the blossoming occurred, in my opinion, in the mid-seventies with the light hand of Kunayev, who was the first to award Leonid Ilich all the positive epithets. Then the baton was taken up by Rashidov, and then went across the entire country.

[Pleshakov] Nikolay Grigoryevich, how did your acquaintances and friends regard your departure from the post of First Secretary of the Moscow Gorkom? Did their behavior change?

[Yegorychev] In some it did. But most of them carried on as if nothing had happened, and even paid special attention to me. My comrades in training and work at the Moscow Higher Technical School supported me, down to virtually the last person. N.S. Patolichev, V.E. Dymshits, A.A. Vishnevskiy, V.A. Kirillin, P.L. Kapitsa, M.K. Yangel and even Marshal G.K. Zhukov, and many others gave me special attention; it is impossible to name all of them.

Soon after my departure Konstantin Mikhaylovich Simonov telephoned me: "Nikolay Grigoryevich, I gave you my diary 'One Hundred Days of War' to look at. How did you find it?" I answered: "Konstantin Mikhaylovich, why are you asking my opinion, I am no longer the Moscow Gorkom First Secretary..." Said Simonov: "Now your opinion is the more important to me." He came to visit me at my home and we sat together in this office for almost 3 hours... That was how Konstantin Mikhaylovich supported me.

This good attitude by people helped me greatly. And everything with work went just fine. I was appointed deputy minister of tractor and agricultural machine building. When I went to the minister, Ivan Flegontovich

Sinit syn, he said: "Nikolay Grigoryevich, I was at the plenum and I saw and heard everything. I am very glad that you have come to work with me. Take a vacation, and start work..." Yes, I was also warmly received in the ministry collective and they tried in every possible way to help me in my work.

Sinit syn created very good work conditions for me even though the sector he assigned to me was a difficult one, namely, the construction of new sector enterprises. When I traveled out to the localities—Omsk, Tselinograd, Volgograd, Chelyabinsk, the Ukraine, Belorussia—my comrades in party work always tried to provide assistance and support in the work. And things went well... This probably did not particularly please Brezhnev. In any event, after 3 years they deemed it expedient to send me as ambassador to Denmark, where I worked for 14 years. And I managed to spend those years usefully for the country: trade turnover between the USSR and Denmark increased by a factor of 10 and good-neighborly relations with that country were strengthened and developed. And the fact that the Danish parliament has for a long time in fact supported the foreign policy line of the Soviet Union with respect to disarmament and detente is a good illustration of this... In any event, I felt needed and useful in that work and I was free of the need to pour out my feelings about L.I. Brezhnev loudly.

Meanwhile, they said to me many times: "Brezhnev is waiting for you." Meaning by this that I should ask to be received by him. However, I always answered that I regreted nothing and that if L.I. Brezhnev wanted to meet then let him call. It is only a 2-hour flight from Copenhagen to Moscow.

I stood my ground and I do not regret it. At any time it is difficult to have and defend one's own convictions and principles, and if one does succeed in defending them one acquires things beyond value, such as people's respect and self-respect. I think that this is precisely why 20 years later I was honored by being chosen by my own Moscow party organization as a delegate to the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Task KPSS "Pravda", "Ogonek", 1989.

Former Official on State Media Policies During Early Brezhnev Years

18300376a Moscow ZHURNALIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 pp 36-39

[Interview with N.N. Mesyatsev, senior scientific associate at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences, by G. Kuznetsov, ZHURNALIST correspondent: "During the Years of 'Cultural Education'"]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] You were appointed the chairman of the State Committee on Radio Broadcasting and Television in

line with the changes in national leadership in October 1964.

[Mesyatsev] I learned of my appointment approximately a week prior to the October Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. The Head of the Department for Administrative Bodies of the Central Committee, N. Mironov, told me: Probably Khrushchev will be released from his duties and what was your attitude on this? I said that I concurred. Then, possibly, you will go to the Committee for Radio Broadcasting and Television.

...And during the entire time the session of the Central Committee Presidium and the Plenum were underway, I was at the Committee on Pyatnitskaya; I was not home for 3 days. Having brought me to Pyatnitskaya, the Central Committee Secretary L. Ilichev introduced me to the collegium members.

[Kuznetsov] What had been your career prior to these events?

[Mesyatsev] After completing the Social Sciences Academy, I worked on the Komsomol Central Committee as a section head and later the secretary for propaganda and the first deputy chairman of the Znaniye Society (I use its present name). I was in China as counsellor ambassador and immediately before my appoint to the Committee worked as the deputy of Yu. Andropov in the Section of the CPSU Central Committee on Ties With Socialist Nations. By this time it was apparent that N. Khrushchev was making major errors in policy. We had placed great hopes on the October (1964) Plenum. It was believed that in society there would be real development of democratic principles and that the new collective leadership would consistently support the course of the 20th and 22d CPSU Congresses and lead the nation forward. To our great regret, these hopes were not realized subsequently.

[Kuznetsov] What we inherited was not bad. After the 22nd Congress, many broadcasts permeated precisely with a democratic spirit appeared on the TV screen.

[Mesyatsev] I feel that that is not a correct view. The Committee was more than an administrative institution. It had to develop the creative sprouts in its collective. At the same time I did not make any particular personnel changes and saw no need for this. It was essential to be able to work with the persons who were there. Remember the writer and frontline veteran S. Smirnov had a program every Friday. I would term many of his broadcasts a "sensation" but for some reason a negative meaning has come to be put into this word. A good sensation is something new which operates primarily on feelings. Smirnov's broadcasts affected the souls of people. In letters many viewers admitted that they had tears of joy and gratitude in becoming acquainted with the defenders of the Brest Fortress and with other heroes whose good name was restored! After the Nazi camps, many served time in the Stalin camps and at that time this was mentioned openly.

[Kuznetsov] Later this subject began to be considered inappropriate and Smirnov was asked to concern himself with finding heroes in everyday working life.

[Mesyatsev] That was later.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of October, there was the 50-series "Chronicle of the Half Century." And there was the outstanding work of the writer K. Simonov with an interview film with the full winners of the Order of Glory! Or how can one forget the work of A. Kapler in creating "Film Panorama" and his exceptionally authoritative tone in talking with viewers?

Radio and television helped the people feel themselves a part of the large Soviet family. Let me mention just one example: the creation of the first all-Union radio and TV ritual "Minute of Silence" on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of our Victory. The broadcast was born in my office. We worked out not only the concept of a "minute of silence" but also in heated disputes honed each phrase, each word. We created, if you like, something like a prayer to the fallen and to those alive and in good health who won the Victory. The capable, investigative journalists I. Kazakova, A. Revenko and S. Volodina, the director Ye. Tarkhanova and others put all their talent into this broadcast. At that time there was no Eternal Flame in Moscow. We built it directly in the studio at Shabolovka. On 9 May 1965, at 1850 hours, this broadcast for the first time went out to all the radio and TV stations of the nation. It is a pity that in subsequent years it was adapted to the stories about Malaya Zemlya and the "great feats" of Brezhnev here. The first edition of the Military Encyclopedia did not include those authors who had actually created this ritual.

We also had another idea. On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, we created the scenario for still another national radio and TV ritual. In our view, the radio and TV impact with the involvement of all the Soviet people (no one should be forgotten—neither the old, the sick, not a single one) could, at least for several hours, rally the people and bring them together by a single biography, by the single memory of their involvement in the fate of the motherland, in the fate of the revolution and in the history, the present and future of the fatherland. But this ritual could also become grounds for reflection and for analyzing what was happening. Moreover, it should bring everyone out into the streets of the cities and villages. The idea was squelched by Suslov. He was afraid of the possible gathering of masses of people and their spontaneous actions.

During these years, one of the main concerns was the designing and building of the national TV center in Ostankino.

[Kuznetsov] Here we must make a lyrical digression. Didn't you come from these parts?

[Mesyatsev] Little could I imagine that running through the Ostankino oak stands as a little boy that such an installation would arise here and I would be involved in its development.... At the Ostankino Pond I once had a fight with fellows from Marinaya Roshcha over a Pioneer necktie. Soon thereafter I defended my Pioneer honor with the aid of the other fellows of the children's home. Our family was large and my father died early on. I studied in a children's home right in the Ostankino Park in the village of Marfino. Incidentally, it was not far from the Ostankino Railroad Station that I first saw Stalin. In the children's home someone noticed that sentries were guarding along the railroad line. Everyone ran off to look. Slowly an unusual train passed through. On a flatcar, beside a coffin with Kirov's body which was being transported from Leningrad stood Stalin with a group of others, smoking a pipe and talking about something. Time passed. Once after lessons in the evening, I escorted through Ostankino Park a female literature teacher named V. Lukashevich. She was the adopted daughter of the writer V. Korlenko, she had been raised on and tried to get across to us the great revolutionary democratic traditions. "Kolya," she said, "we must not deify any person as we deify Stalin. This is a cult of personality of one man. This provides such vast power that any actions are possible by this man." At that time, I did not understand the entire meaning of what was said as well as all her boldness. The scope of Stalin's crimes are becoming understood only now, although the 20th CPSU Congress which I attended was a revelation. Who could have thought then that the tragedy was doomed to be repeated in the form of a farce?

[Kuznetsov] The establishing of the Ostankino TV Center was, as they say, for "cultural education" or ironically light between cults. For this reason the very notion of multiprogram broadcasting which was established at that time is of interest.

[Mesyatsev] The two national programs, the program for Moscow and Moscow Oblast and the educational program.

[Kuznetsov] Please tell us in more detail about the so-called "Fourth Program" as it existed for a very short time.

[Mesyatsev] There were experimental broadcasts just for Moscow. They were conceived of as national ones. In addition to the first main sociopolitical and artistic program, another one was planned. It was designed as cultural and educational in the initial sense. But in talks among ourselves the expression was used of "a program for the intelligentsia." Was it right in endeavoring to be comprehensible for all to aim at the "middleman"? This did not satisfy the more developed strata of society. There should be an alternative or a choice. I assumed that a program with a high intellectual level was essential along with the main one because the intelligentsia

replenishes the spirit of the people. To a large degree the mood and potential of the entire society depend upon how we work with the intelligentsia.

What, incidentally, was the colossal error of Brezhnev? Because of its insufficient intellect he did not truly consider those enormous changes which were occurring in the world. The scientific and technical revolution, the changes in the political balance of forces in the world and the increased spiritual potential of our people—proper attention was not given to all of this.

[Kuznetsov] But propaganda cannot be better than the policy which it serves. Although the chairman of the State Committee seemingly should be one of those advisors of the leadership which would help in making a political choice.

[Mesyatsev] I did endeavor to bring certain ideas to the leadership. For example, such a seemingly obvious one...I tried for our radio and television to be given the right to break the news on important events. Thus, in 1965, our cosmonauts landed in the taya and they could not be immediately found. "It is essential to announce at least initial information that searches are underway," I said. Our airwaves were silent for 2 days. D. Ustinov was particularly active against this. From this example I was convinced that the Western radio was listened to because it beat us in providing information. But the ingrained tradition of silence got the upper hand.

[Kuznetsov] You, I recall, tried to establish human relations with your Western partners. There was some story about your stay at the Russian Service of BBC.

[Mesyatsev] I had normal professional relations with the general director of the BBC, Hugh Green. Once he took me to the studio where the direct broadcasting to the USSR was going on. We looked through the glass at the announcers. I said to him jokingly: "Let me have the mike. I will say: Fellows, this is me, Mesyatsev, listen to me! Here at BBC is the intelligent commentator Anatoliy Maksimovich Golberg and he has just admitted to me that his "independent" radio station coordinates its political broadcasts with its own British MID." Golberg was standing nearby and said, Mister Minister, I can confirm that...generally we had a good time. But I had gone there for serious matters, for studying their professional experience. Before starting broadcasting from Ostankino, we studied the experience of the leading radio and TV organizations of the world. In addition to England, I visited France and Japan. Our scientific-procedural section organized the publishing of abstract reviews of foreign literature on television journalism and the most interesting works were translated in their entirety.

[Kuznetsov] These pamphlets even now are used in exercises with students of the journalism faculty. But there were no more such publications.

[Mesyatsev] While the new TV center was going up and the tower was rising, personnel had to be trained. In Moscow there was an announcement and all were invited who wished to try their forces as announcers and commentators. The best were chosen for a 2-year course. Many of them are now on the air. Good ties were established with the press. The most intelligent critical materials were reviewed at the collegium. But not in the aim of punishing anyone but rather not to give ourselves airs. A creative man must be given the right to make a mistake, he should work without being afraid and should work for the sake of honor and conscience and not only for wages. What did I, in my view, succeed in doing in this main most essential thing? To establish a good creative atmosphere in the collective. I saw that my presence did not intimidate the people and they said what they thought in my presence.

[Kuznetsov] Among the veterans of the airwaves there are many stories about those times. For example, a radio essay "On Truth" had been prepared. Academician I. Tamm and the writer V. Dudintsev were to speak on truth in science while a rayon newspaperman was to speak about general and local truth and so forth. The broadcast did not go on the airwaves. Its author turned to the Committee chairman. In your office you assembled the editors-in-chief, put a tape on the recorder and listened to the broadcast. The broadcast clearly was rather sharp and the editors-in-chief decided not to give the "OK." But then you said: "Let the broadcast go on the airwaves but without Dudintsev." Was that true?

[Mesyatsev] There are scores of such stories. Of course, support for bold broadcasts was possible only within certain limits. The name of Dudintsev was among those who appearance on the airwaves or in the press at that time was impossible in principle. But I did not have the right and did not want to refer to anyone....

Nor could I support my comrade Boris Firsov who headed Leningrad Television. Do you know that story?

[Kuznetsov] There was a direct broadcast from Leningrad. A roundtable is now the most widespread form but at that time it was the most dangerous. And then the writer V. Soloukhin stated that it would not be a bad thing to return the old names of the Volga cities. This evoked immediate anger on the highest level and you received instructions to intervene in the course of the broadcast and oppose Soloukhin with the "correct" viewpoint. However, they were unable to do this in Leningrad....

[Mesyatsev] Generally that is true. And I could not defend Firsov.

[Kuznetsov] It was not so bad for Boris Maksimovich [Firsov] as he was a prominent sociologist and doctor of sciences. Chiefly the viewers suffered as the sharpness of the debate broadcasts gradually diminished.

[Mesyatsev] The public was persuaded that there could only be one viewpoint. Even in the Central Committee Plenum, when N. Yegorychev, also one of my comrades, voiced certain critical comments on some domestic questions, he was immediately fired. And he was the first secretary of the Moscow Party Gorkom and a Central Committee member. Uniformity in judgments was inculcated by various measures including harsh ones. This was shortsighted. And stupid. If a reader only hears cries of approval and surrounds himself with boot-lickers then his policy is doomed. No one would ever dare correct him even in the event of an obvious absurdity of an "unanimous" decision. And this was what happened subsequently.

Instructions were received that L. Brezhnev and the other higher leaders were to be shown in a ratio of 3:1, that is, the general secretary should be 3 times more on the screen than all the others. They were also zealous in monitoring the scope of the plans. However, during trips and from the rostrum of the party activists, I repeated that the only cult in our nation could be the cult of the working man, the worker, the kolkhoz member or engineer. Before a parade or demonstration I said to the directors and cameramen directly: Don't show one person, show the people more. So my own views began to contradict those which I received "from above."

I recall that I received a comment from those close to Brezhnev: Wait a minute, Kosygin arrived in London and you had him on the air for 20 minutes. He was sitting in a gilded armchair and then this is shown to the people, 3 minutes would have been enough and this causes dissatisfaction in you-know-who. "But he is the chairman of the nation's Council of Ministers," I said. And to myself I thought this is immoral.

[Kuznetsov] Except for reports from Red Square, on the air there was a noticeable decline in the number of direct broadcasts. This was precisely under you. Is it not a paradox that the development of equipment contributed to stagnation.

[Mesyatsev] At that time, we underestimated this danger. We were merely happy that such new complicated equipment and the video tape recorder had appeared. There was an opportunity for the creative workers to make the broadcast better quality and more systematic. And this often led to a situation where they began to edit out a "dubious" thought. As soon as there was something wrong, the editors would find their phones ringing with calls from the very top, from family members and from workers of the apparatus....

[Kuznetsov] What could you, as a viewer, say about today's television broadcast?

[Mesyatsev] When I watch discussions with viewers on the telephone and with the participation of people in the street, I am happy. A direct airwave, an open airwave is a school for indoctrinating in the people a democratic

way of thinking and action. Of course, this process takes up a good deal of time. But I really envy those who work today in television and radio, devoting their energy and reason to creativity. In risking to win a rebuke from the reader of a certain idealization of the past, let me affirm that we were working for restructuring even then. Multiprogram broadcasting had begun to gather strength. Thus, the start on 1 January 1968 of the first broadcast of the program Time became a success in information. This was done with affection, informally and emotionally, under the leadership of the Editor-in-Chief N. Biryukov. Or another example. We began to conduct all-Union competitions of popular talents. Or the 4-series film of the director L. Pchelkin "Lines for a Portrait" from the scenario of M. Shatrov. In my view, no one portrayed Lenin better than M. Ulyanov. By all its content, this film and particularly the series "The Air of the Sovnarkom [Council of People's Commissars]" restored against the conceit, routine, senselessness and self-glorification that which most concerned the people who during those years were thinking and concerned for the motherland. We organized a viewing for the leadership, the film was unacceptable and was pigeonholed. Later on, they say, they even demanded that it be erased. But that was already after my departure. The film was recently shown. In my fate, this film probably played the role of the last straw.... Even before this I felt that I was becoming out of place. I wondered whether I should retire or wait until I was removed.

[Kuznetsov] In our country, it seems people don't retire.

[Mesyatsev] That is quite true. Generally speaking, I waited it out. In May 1970, I was dismissed and sent as ambassador to Australia.

[Kuznetsov] An honorable exile.

[Mesyatsev] For me it was a shameful exile. At that time, I was not even 50. An age had come when the experience gained in life could, it seemed to me, provide a maximum benefit. But...I would not like to continue this matter. I can see that you have prepared other questions.

[Kuznetsov] On the journal RT. This unique publication arose in your period, it lasted a short time and then also under you was regenerated as the well-known TV program. Why did this happen?

[Mesyatsev] The magazine was large size, on excellent paper and looked very good due to the outstanding artist N. Litvinov. The magazine was even given a prize for design, if I remember, in Italy. Soon thereafter Suslov made the comment to me: that we were not saving paper and there was a lot of "air." But it was not a matter of "air" but rather the content of the articles. We had assembled good journalists for RT. The art section was headed by A. Zolotov and the literary section by M. Roshchin. Also working were L. Likhodeyev, M. Moyev, A. Vasinskiy and I. Sarkisyan. Even now the old issues of the magazine look good against the background of

restructuring. Re-read the materials on democracy and on the important role of television and radio in creating public opinion. The articles of V. Khlebnikov and I. Babel were also there.... But perhaps we overdid it. Instructions were received to limit the creativity to annotations and strict reporting. One issue simply did not go on sale. That one had the ideas of A. Strelyanyy on the question of a book entitled "What is a Kolkhoz."

[Kuznetsov] The comrades recall in what an original form you express your indignation to them. Why, you said, write about a kolkhoz? We even have certain politburo members who do not know what a kolkhoz is....

[Mesyatsev] Once I said about the Central Committee Secretary A. Kirilenko that he always had a cleared desk and he played tic-tac-toe with himself out of boredom. They immediately began knocking on his door....

[Kuznetsov] Incidentally about humor. Why did it happen that funny broadcasts began to disappear from the airwaves?

[Mesyatsev] They began to disappear in the wave of artificially created celebration. Each year grounds were found for a major jubilee and how could there be any laughter in a jubilee year? In the place of the "television satire slot" they ordered that jubilee TV spectacles. The radio broadcast "Again 25" caused dissatisfaction. It went on the air at 8:30, when the leadership was driving to work and the car radios were tuned to the beacon station. I moved this program to 7 in the morning and there were no more complaints. Even the tsars had jesters who were allowed to say the truth and if the people don't laugh then society is sick.

[Kuznetsov] Well, the people haven't stopped laughing. Only the broadcast workers themselves lost their sense of humor. For a complete picture, we should point out that the expansive and good minister had an intelligent cruel deputy who despised subordinates. This relates to the question of the creative climate.

[Mesyatsev] This was mentioned to me. And I endeavored to indoctrinate him. I did not like complainers. And I said once to the aktiv that if one of you goes and informs on others I will apply severe measures. In order not to start a squabble in the collective. Were you working with us then?

[Kuznetsov] I was an extra leader of the last section for direct broadcasting. Seemingly it remained the last. It was the "Relay of News." Recently near the TV center I met my editor of those years, Izolda Yegorova. I had not seen her for a long time and she said to me: Oh, how I had to put up with you then! And I could see that she was still angry, although 19 years had passed. I had forgotten what the problem was but she recalled it for me. It turned out that during the broadcast for Constitution Day, where 33-year-olds born the same year as the 1936 Constitution had assembled in the studio and I mentioned "the age of Jesus

Christ." At that time I could not see why I was again taken off the airwaves and regarded unpleasantly.

[Mesyatsev] Unfortunately, I do not recall that instance. But I certainly remember well the regular leaders and, of course, Yu. Fokin. I did employ that measure of removing a person from the airwaves for 6 months if he committed some unseemly act, a total of three times and against the announcers.

[Kuznetsov] Had you been a commentator, Nikolay Nikolayevich [Mesyatsev], you also would not have been allowed on the air for your picturesque, remarkable phrases. The tragedy of giant organizations is that between the "top" and "bottom" there is an impenetrable layer, a "broken telephone" and a lack of feedback. I again failed my editor as soon as the period of punishment was over. On 8 March in an interview with a jeweler she asked me, in showing me attractive earrings, whether I would give such to my girlfriend or not? I replied that I would if they did not cost more than a motor vehicle. That reply caused a lot of trouble! "Did you wish to say that our motor vehicles are too expensive?" Again I was canceled and as it turned out, for many years. A new chairman arrived in May. And I must tell you, Nikolay Nikolayevich, that the regular journalists considered your departure just as you considered the replacement of Khrushchev. They soon realized that they were cruelly in error.

[Mesyatsev] I understand....

[Kuznetsov] My last question is about your last statement from a major publication in the journal KOMSOMOLSKAYA ZHIZN under the title "Freedom of Thought and Spirit" (No 18, 1988). You were challenged by the First Secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee V. Semichastnyy before the very plenum devoted to the 40th anniversary of the Komsomol.

[Mesyatsev] Yes, we had been so bold as to correct the text on the question of B. Pasternak as it had been dictated by Khrushchev. He demanded that Semichastnyy's report include such rubbish....

[Kuznetsov] But they did not correct anything! Certainly this has gone down once and for all in history as: "A pig would not do what he has done, he has fouled where he eats."

[Mesyatsev] But it was much worse in the original version! They did what they could. They toned it down. Do not do this as the blow could have been worse. In the journal I gave an assessment of this episode that the Komsomol in vain had assumed the mission of criticizing Pasternak. Why did the writers expel him from their ranks?!

[Kuznetsov] Many of us have been confronted with such a choice. To carry out an order is to sin against one's conscience. But not to do so forces them to remind you that freedom of spirit ends where compulsion begins.

[Mesyatsev] I knew the works of Pasternak. But I had not read "Doctor Zhivago." Now imagine the picture: it was just 3 hours until the plenum, I was responsible for the entire artistic part and I was to give a report in the presence of foreign guests, and then all of a sudden the addition by Khrushchev.... Even then I could not act against my conviction. And if I had betrayed my convictions then probably I would have adapted later on, in the 1970s, I would have curried Brezhnev's favor like some did. For many during the years of stagnation life was not bad, including for journalists.

[Kuznetsov] Probably, each of us is now looking inwards....

[Mesyatsev] Only we must not be hypocrites. We are a nation of pioneers and we do not have the right to senselessly revile everyone and everything that was done. A desire to live honestly and conscientiously has survived and will live on in people forever. Without this today's restructuring cannot come about.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda", "Zhurnalist", 1989.

Moscow Patriarchy to Republish Bible

18000652 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 12 Mar 89 p 2

[Letter under "Dialog" rubric: "Have You Read the Bible?"]

[Text] **Where can I buy a Bible?** [Signed] O. Markova,
Novosibirsk

K. Komarov, principle secretary of THE JOURNAL OF THE MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE, informed us that all 100,000 copies of the Bible published in commemoration of the Millennium of the Christening of Rus have been sold.

Aware of the great demand for this book, however, the patriarchy's publishing department hopes to issue an additional 50,000 copies by the end of the year. The Bible costs 30 rubles. It will be shipped to eparchies, monasteries and ecclesiastical schools.

"Dialog," incidentally, discovered that on the "black" market the Bible costs 70 rubles or more.

State publishing houses do not intend to publish the Bible themselves. In 1990, however, the publication of a 6-7 volume collection entitled "From Genesis to Revelation," which will include scholarly translations of several books from the Old and New Testaments, is planned. The collection is intended for scholars and specialists; Politizdat will publish 200,000 copies.

Essays Examine New Thinking on Religion, Atheism

18000313 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA
in Russian 19 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by V. Kharazov, special correspondent to the journal NAUKA I RELIGIYA under the rubric "Among the Books": "Atheism, What Should It Be Like?"]

[Text] We are living in an amazing time. That which seemed courageous yesterday, has become a commonplace today. Many socio-political books are becoming outdated, as they say, "at the root", even before they get to the sales counter of the store. Not every author manages to win in the competition with time and with the swiftness of those processes which are currently taking place in our society.

In a situation when former stereotypes are cracking, when many former approaches to the problems of atheistic education have become hopelessly antiquated, and new approaches are still being worked out, a certain courage is required to write and publish a book on this topic.

There is no denying that the authors of the collection of articles "Atheistic Education: Search, Problems", which recently came out of the Kartya Moldovenyaskhe Publishing House have such courage. Of course, they did not all, nor in all respects win their race with time. However, this, probably, is quite natural.

The editor of the collection, assistant professor V.G. Gutsu, candidate of philosophical sciences and lecturer for the Moldavian CP Central Committee, assembled an interesting and representative group of authors. Among them are well-known experts in the field of scientific atheism, party, soviet, and Komsomol workers, and teachers at secondary schools and higher educational institutions.

An article by N.F. Bondarchuk, the secretary of the Moldavian CP Central Committee leads off the collection. After analyzing the present condition of atheistic education in the republic and reflecting upon ways and methods for restructuring it, the author sets the tone for the entire collection by noting that "today, complex and contradictory processes are taking place in the sphere of spiritual mores" and that "it is very important to avoid an oversimplified approach to them."

Of course, such a momentous event as the 1,000-year anniversary of the introduction of Christianity in Russia cannot be neglected. Without focusing on this anniversary, many authors mention it by making, basically, a rather objective of the role and place of the Russian Orthodox Church in our nation's history.

One must note here that after the ceremonial celebration of the 1,000-year anniversary of the introduction of Christianity in Russia, a slight turmoil arose in the minds of certain believers, representatives of the creative intelligentsia, and even the atheists. Personally I see several reasons which gave rise to this turmoil. Firstly, the novelty and the great volume of information which spewed forth concerning religion, the church, and believers. Secondly, the numerous appearances in the mass media by religious figures, primarily, representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church. It is clear that in their anniversary speeches they emphasized the positive aspects in the history and activities of the church and assiduously avoided (which is natural for any anniversary) those historical stages and situations in which the church did not appear in its best light. It goes without saying that many of the evaluations of the role of religion and the church in the history and spiritual life of society were also their own personal evaluations. And thirdly, appearances by journalists and certain representatives of the creative intelligentsia, which were emotional, but, unfortunately, were seldom objective or competent. A paradoxical situation has arisen—namely journalists and writers in a number of instances have attributed to religion and the church such merits which, bearing in mind a sense of measure and historical truth, not even religious figures have laid claim to.

There is no doubt that the return to the Leninist norms of relating to the church and the believers and the breaking of many of the preconceived attitudes and stereotypes have also played their role. And finally, the publicists' aspiration to create a very unattractive image of atheism and to attribute many sins to it, which are by no means peculiar to it. At this point it is appropriate to refer to Dm. Balashov's article in ZNAMYA issue No 8, in which the author stated, a conference of "atheists-non-believers" supposedly took place somewhere in the 1960's, which resolved to destroy or reconstruct all the churches in the nation, depriving them of their traditional outward appearance.

There is no need to refute this and outrageous fabrications like it. However, they continue to make a certain impression on some people. And it is not surprising that the question is arising in some people, but do we need atheism today and doesn't atheistic education contradict the principle of freedom of conscience?

A.S. Onishchenko, corresponding member of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, raises this question and examines it in detail in the collection of articles. And quite correctly, after answering the question, he shifts the discussion to another plane: the crux of the problem is in exactly what kind of atheism do we need today?

At this point I would like to remark that in glancing back at the past, one can distinguish three concepts of atheism, which existed simultaneously (and at times still do exist). These are Marxist-Leninist atheism, which proceeds from an understanding of religion as a social phenomenon. This singularly scientific atheism has always opposed any attempts to fight against religion and religiousness using forcible measures and orders and decrees and it predicted that religion would disappear to the extent that socialism developed.

The second concept is administrative-bureaucratic atheism. It was exactly this bureaucratic "atheism" which committed us to the mass closing of churches and prayer houses at the beginning of the 1960's and the adoption of decrees, in accordance with which even criticism of the legislation concerning religious cults was equivalent to a criminal offense.

And, finally, vulgar atheism, which is based on common ignorance, is rude, and insults the believers' religious feelings.

One should note that certain officials, who have in the past closed churches and prayer houses through administrative methods, today are attempting to shift all the blame to someone else, by attributing the responsibility for their own actions to the propagandists and theorists of scientific Marxist-Leninist atheism.

Such attempts to discredit Marxist-Leninist atheism in the eyes of the general public are by no means harmless. And A.S. Onishchenko's conclusion that "the actions of unbelieving functionaries-bureaucrats should not be

identified with scientific-atheistic policy", is completely legitimate and based on principle.

Today religion, in the person of clergymen and theologians, is striving not to quarrel with science and not to oppose it, but to add it to its arsenal, by interpreting scientific achievements in its own way. Professor M.N. Lozan, doctor of biological sciences, has revealed the workings of this process in striking and interesting examples in the field of natural sciences.

As we have already noted, along with leaders and theorists, practical workers also wrote articles for the collection. Among them people, who have devoted more than one decade to this work and who have amassed abundant experience and achieved excellent results, such as I.I. Makritskiy, for example, the principal of the Feteshtskaya Secondary School in Yedintsy Rayon.

Today, religious organizations have actively participated in the dialogue concerning methods of reviving the people's spirituality and strengthening the mores of society.

It is gratifying that the authors of the collection of articles also did not evade the most pressing problem. The collection of articles states, "Atheism does not refute morality, but its supernatural origin. A morality, which is controlled not by forces that are external with respect to mankind, but by scientific self-consciousness is more deliberate and humane".

Of course, there were also questionable statements by the authors and individual theses, which one could hardly agree with, such as was the case with D.N. Tabakaru, "who was excommunicated" from films and television by the majority of the followers of the evangelical Christian-Baptists.

However, this is not what determines the quality and actuality of the collection. Its universality is good and at times a very high scientific standard is apparent and at the same time the popular method of stating even very complex problems and of addressing issues, which are worrying the public today, make it useful and interesting for everyone, who to some degree or other is concerned with the theory and practice of atheistic education. However, I think that those, who are merely interested in the problems of religion and atheism, will read many of the articles for their own benefit.

Moslem Georgians' Reconversion to Christianity Urged

18130050 Tbilisi LITERATURULI SAKARTVELO
in Georgian No 51, 23 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by Revaz Tvaradze: "Attainment of the Ideal"]

[Text] Anyone who listened last Friday evening (16 December) to the television talk by Professor Otar Giginishvili, deputy director of the Oriental Institute,

was, I think, probably shocked. Not exactly because of what Otar Gigineishvili said but because of the anxiety that his talk evoked. The fact that I think his position is disputable is something I'll explain below. First I want to say something else: The speaker formulated his argument brilliantly; his every phrase was strictly logical and sounded convincing overall. It all attested, moreover, that the speaker is thoroughly knowledgeable about the issue at hand; his thoughts on the matter have not been put together hastily but worked out over the years and formed into a well-ordered viewpoint. In this respect his television talk cannot be faulted.

What was shocking was something else. It made plain once more how many troublesome problems, which for decades were concealed and hushed up, still face the Georgian people in all their inexorability, problems which must be coped with and solved as soon as possible. Political, demographic, cultural, social, ecological problems... Georgia's eastern region, southeastern, southern, southwestern, northwestern, northern....

But we lack a unified viewpoint, a single explicit principle, a comprehensively, thoroughly worked-out, carefully weighed program of action appropriate to realistic development. Why this is or whose fault it is, is something we will not pursue at this point. If nothing else, everyone is well aware that any nation merits the destiny it has earned ("the fate of a being is in itself").

Here, I think, something else is more important: not to let the abundance and difficulty of our problems faze or terrify us, not to let a stifling sense of helplessness overpower us. Let us recall, finally, that Georgia has been in worse trouble many times!

Now let us return to the subject.

It is hard, generally, to reconstruct completely a television feature heard only once. I shall try, nevertheless, to convey accurately the main points which the esteemed Otar Gigineishvili brought up:

1. We are faced with a reality—a Christian Georgia and a Moslem Georgian community of considerable size (one out of every four Georgians, in Georgia or outside of it, is a follower of Islam). There is no way this reality can be ignored. Our ancestors knew it very well, to the extent that they not only acknowledged the Mohammedan persuasion of a portion of the Georgians and refrained from opposing it—they even translated the Koran for them so that they might profess their faith in Georgian.

2. The religion of Mohammed is in no way damaging to a Georgian's Georgianity. There are numerous followers of Islam, even fanatical ones, who would never even think of giving up or losing their national identity—their Georgianity.

3. This matter requires an extremely careful approach. Any thoughtless or hasty actions can pose a great danger to us.

In my opinion, these were the main points that were brought up in the talk.

Is there anything to quarrel with in these propositions? They appear to be quite correct, completely logical propositions—if we share their author's starting principle. But his starting principle, as far as I understand it, is that this inexorable reality is by its nature immutable, irreversible, leaving no alternative; there is no help for it. The Georgian Mohammedan community will have to remain just that. Any attempt to change things in that regard is doomed to failure.

It is this starting principle which I consider disputable. I hope to God I'm wrong. For then I (and probably many Georgians) would not have to see the terrifying chasm, splitting the Georgian nation, which the sharing of that principle would cause.

The esteemed Otar Gigineishvili's formula goes: Blood—Georgian, language—Georgian, faith—Christian and Mohammedan. Let us take that formula and imagine an ideal circumstance, one that has been longed for throughout the centuries. Let us imagine all Georgians, those in Georgia and those living outside, united, inhabiting a single state (at this point let us not pursue the means or form by which this might be realized) speaking one language, having one economy, one social system. Would these factors be sufficient to establish SPIRITUAL unity? It should not be necessary to explain that without spiritual unity, a nation cannot be called a nation.

Spiritual life is manifested in facts of culture. Georgian culture essentially is—or at any rate was for 16 centuries—a Christian culture. At the same time, a Georgian Islamic culture simply does not exist. In such a circumstance, what is the Georgian Mohammedan population based on? How can the fervently pious Mohammedan Georgian absorb and assimilate the Georgian Christian culture? And if he does absorb, assimilate, love it, and make it his own, there is no way he can remain a follower of Islam. If he cannot assimilate it and make it his own, then he ends up without a history, without a past, an entity deprived of spiritual foundation, incapable of merging organically in the nation's cultural life and in the cause of rebuilding the future (for the future rests on the present, the present on the past). Where, then, shall we seek a whole Georgia, united and indivisible? Instead of Georgianity we are faced with two different peoples who have little understanding of one another. Three quarters are Christian Georgians, one quarter are Mohammedans. As I understand it, it was exactly this kind of circumstance which split India and Pakistan.

It could be said in response that in our atheistic state most of the population are not very keen on religion, and the younger generation especially is growing up under circumstances in which the question of religious persuasion hardly comes up. Somehow it doesn't seem that this is the case. True, Otar Gigineishvili asserted on television that people in the Islamic countries these days take nationality rather than religion to be the prime criterion (and as we know, he is one of the most outstanding specialists we have on these matters). In my observation, however, it is more reasonable to speak of the rebirth of pan-Islamism today than any weakening of the influence of Islam. Not only that, the situation that obtains today in several republics of the Soviet Union is very significant in this regard. The slogans that were hoisted at the large rally just a while ago in Baku surely back up this assertion.

But there is another aspect to the matter. Generally, Georgians who are followers of Islam are uncomfortable when the subject of their religion comes up. This is only natural. Just as, for example, a Georgian living in the 8th century was a dedicated defender of Christianity against the Mohammedans, because he was backed up by the strong tradition of several centuries of Christian religion, the strong Islamic tradition has also been established among Moslem Georgians for several centuries, and it doesn't help matters to be reminded that their forefathers were forcibly Moslemized.

It also doesn't help to note that our educational endeavors along these lines are confined to a handful of half-hearted measures. A couple of things need to be said about this matter as well—or, more accurately, the causes of it. For several decades all those who professed any religion—except Christianity—have felt more or less at ease here. Everything has been done to diminish the Georgian Church. (It is a wonder how it survived under such conditions—not only survived but has even begun to prosper lately!) For this reason, during rare dialogues with Mohammedan Georgians, arguments about religion have been absolutely ruled out, and the dialogues have been one-sided in character. Quite aside from that, without such arguments concerning religion, expressions like “we are brothers” or “our shared history” remain nothing but declarations and empty phrases. Because our shared history, the history of the Georgian nation, is the history of a CHRISTIAN NATION (concerning which, see Apolon Silagadze's fine article in the 29 November 1988 edition of KOMUNISTI).

Therefore, if we are to imagine an ideal situation of the future, our ideal and the object of our aspiration must certainly be to reconvert Moslem Georgians back to the Christian faith. Otherwise, Georgian unity can never be completely reborn. I firmly believe that this is the certain truth.

Anyone who acknowledges this truth, however, must also certainly realize that the attainment of the ideal is confronted by today's clear reality, which simply cannot

be ignored. And if we desire to attain the ideal, this most complicated problem must be made an inseparable part of our national program of action.

What is sad is that I personally do not foresee the formulation of such a program, a thoroughly worked-out, carefully weighed, perfected program appropriate to the actual situation anytime in the near future.

This also is a clear and inexorable reality.

Adjarians' Ethnic, Religious Bonds With Georgia Stressed

*18130051 Tbilisi LITERATURULI SAKARTVELO
in Georgian No 51, 23 Dec 88 p 5*

[Article by Pridon Khalvashi: “My Adjaria!”]

[Text]

Sunny Adjaria's Celebration

A solemn meeting dedicated to the 110th anniversary of Adjaria's restoration to Mother Georgia was held on 24 November in the Batumi Ilia Chavchavadze State Theater.

Members of the presidium included leaders of Adjaria's party and soviet organs, eminent figures in literature and the arts, Tbilisi guests Guram Pandzhikidze, Levan Sanikidze, Ioram Kemertelidze, Vakhtang Kotetishvili, Givi Alkhaziashvili, Shadiman Shamanadze, Batu Danelia, and others.

The meeting was opened by Davit Diasamidze, chairman of the Presidium of the Adjarian ASSR Supreme Soviet.

A speech was given by Guram Emiridze, a candidate member of the Buro of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and First Secretary of the Adjarian Obkom, who spoke about Adjaria's tortuous and struggle-filled yet glorious path, its accomplishments today, and the tasks of the future.

Participants in the solemn meeting were greeted by Davit Khakhutaishvili, director of the Batumi N. Berdzenishvili Scientific-Research Institute and corresponding member of the Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences; Guram Pandzhikidze, secretary of the Georgian Writers Union and a Rustaveli Prize Laureate; Professor Mamia Gogolishvili, director of the Tbilisi Botanical Garden of the Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences; poet Pridon Khalvashi, executive secretary of the Adjarian Department of the Georgian Writers Union and a Rustaveli Prize Laureate; Aleksandre Samsonia, editor-in-chief of the journal CHOROKHI; writer Levan Sanikidze; and poet Zurab Gorgiladze.

The meeting concluded with a concert of celebration.

At the first meeting with delegates from newly liberated Adjara in Tbilisi, Grigol Orbeliani said: "We joyfully give thanks to the Lord and pray that this reunion of ours will endure forever and ever... From this day forward we will share our joys and sorrows, being the children of the one Mother Georgia."

Akaki Tsereteli stated: "Even these our brothers, who were separated from us several centuries, still maintained the sweet speech of the mother tongue. We see now that the promise of our forefathers has been kept on that side and this, from which it appears that the brotherly bond between us has never been broken!"

Ilia Chavchavadze wrote: "Besides the fact that we are of one blood and one flesh, and speak one and the same language, we also have one history."

Workers of the newspaper SAKHALKHO PURTSELI went to visit Vazha-Pshavela, who was ill. The bard asked what was new. All Georgians are collecting contributions for our afflicted Adjarian brothers, the representatives of the editors told him. His eyes brimming with tears, Vazha took a couple of rubles from under his pillow and gave them to the delegates to help the Adjarians, and he said: "Helpless in bed though I am, my soul rejoices in the hope that Christian and Moslem Georgians will again be joined together by the mortar of our nationality. I have personally traveled about Adjara, in Kobuleti, Klardzheti, Tao, and magnificent Meskhetia, our dear Moslem Georgia today. It is a wonderful country. The remains of our culture which are scattered there are the soul of our nation...."

Yes, that's what Georgia's luminaries were writing and saying about you, dear Adjara. Georgia's best sons were concerned about you and cared for you—people like Davit Kldiashvili, Zakaria Chichinadze, Giorgi Tsereteli, Dimitri Bakradze, Tedo Sakhokia, Giorgi Khazbegi, and Sergei Meskhi. Later, Galaktion Tabidze, Giorgi Leonidze, Simon Chikovani, Paolo Iashvili, Titsian Tabidze, Karlo Kaladze, Viktor Gabeskiria, Grigol Abashidze, Irakli Abashidze, Aleksandre Sadzhaia, Ioseb Noneshvili, and many others came to you, paid homage to you, comforted you, and anointed your heart's still unhealed wounds with the balm of native speech.

Your return to Mother Georgia, dear Adjara, meant more than the mere restoration of territory. It was also the hope of a hope of other, greater restorations. I believe there is no celebration that is closer to us or more precious than this return. I believe, therefore, that this day of your rebirth—the day of reunion forevermore with Mother Georgia—ought to be made part of the Georgian calendar every year and that this date should always be solemnly observed.

You have traveled a long, difficult, dark-enshrouded path, dear Adjara, torn from your mother's breast, conquered, taken captive, insulted and injured, 300 years of hopelessness and helpless enslavement. Mother

Georgia groaned because she lacked the power to extend to you the helping hand. And you were not alone in being torn from the bosom of your Motherland! Tao, Shavsheti, Erusheti, and Klardzheti with their churches of Oshki, Khakhuli, and Tbeti, the first and most sublime centers of our spiritual culture and numerous other fortresses and cathedrals, our ancient Georgian shrines and centers of enlightenment, are all still silent, gazing upon you and longing for your fate, dear Adjara!

Do you remember how your blood crimsoned the rapids of the Chorokhi, the Acharistskali, the Machakheli, the Chvani, the Kintrishi, and the Akavreta—and why? Because you were among the first Georgian regions to accept Christianity, as far back as the 3rd century. For "The Chronicle of Georgia" records: "Then came... Andria to the city of Trebizond, which is a town of the Mingrelians, and he tarried for a time... And he went forth and came unto a land in Kartli [Georgia] which is called Great Adjara, and began to preach the gospel. ... And they built a wondrous church unto the most holy Mother of God."

For 1400 years you carried aloft the banner of Christianity in holy faithfulness and, in company with neighboring enlightened ancient Georgian lands, you carried forth our nation's civilization.

Those who could, those were able, pulled up stakes from the places watered with the tears of our fathers, in order to preserve the faith of holy doctrine which constituted the bulwark of our nation's creed. They fled to other Georgian lands. More than half the population of Adjara left at that time. Those who remained, however, were forced and tortured into accepting the religion of alien conquerors. And that is how you, Adjara, came to fall under the faith of Mohammed—and not you alone but also many other ancient lands of southern Georgia.

But they could never take away your mother tongue. You never gave up the Georgian language. When they defiled all your other shrines, the Georgian language, rooted deep in your soul and flowering with the fire of your heart, became the cathedral of your nation's faith.

This is why we say today that the Georgian language is for us the religion of Georgian unity and wholeness. And this implies that he who speaks in Georgian, wherever he may be, whatever religion he may profess, is still a Georgian.

Such a slogan, intended sincerely and with the idea of inner truth, will hearten the millions of our countrymen still living in a foreign world who have turned to their cherished "Memleket"—Georgia—and foster their national self-determination [samooopredeleniye]. Otherwise, if we declare that only those professing a specific religion are Georgians, we will be serving the cause of all our old and new enemies—we will be diminishing Georgia and reducing the numbers of the Georgian people.

This does not, however, prevent us from encouraging the already kindled desire in the souls of Moslem Georgians to return to their old religion, Orthodox Christianity. Such a process is long and difficult. It requires patience, support, trust, understanding, and, again, great love for one another. Many of us are aware that many young Adjarian families have already returned to the religion of their forefathers, Christianity. Soon the Skhalta Cathedral will be restored, and a native of the region who is now studying in the Theological Seminary will go there to serve. Moreover, all Orthodox or Catholic Georgian monuments within Adjarian territory, once restored to health, will soon be turned over to their rightful owners. But we must categorically and unwaveringly stipulate that services in active churches are to be conducted only in Georgian, always.

But, how does one of our people view that conquerer's religion which still persists among those of his own kind? Let me repeat something I have said before: Any religion which does not permit me to speak to God in my native language, to say my prayers in Georgian, can hardly illuminate my heart and soul. And you, Adjaria, also think that way, for I—your native son—say it. I believe it will be necessary to include something of the history of religion in future school texts. It is especially essential for you, Adjaria, that your child be aware of how Christianity came to your land and what it brought. It is no less essential, in the same way, that we teach the child what evil power installed Islam here, when and at what cost in blood, and what misfortune followed.

O my Adjaria, you do not forget for an instant that your real national faith and consciousness have ascended only under Soviet conditions. In these new times no one can say that anyone has restricted the Georgian language and Georgian national aspirations here. Quite the contrary: the desire for our own national self-determination has always been considered the preeminent sign of our valor and patriotism. This kind of treatment, this atmosphere, this support has nurtured us.

In the years of Soviet rule, education, the economy, and the national culture have reached undreamed-of heights. Six or seven decades ago, Adjaria, your native sons included very few people literate in Georgian, let alone any writers, artists, and painters. However much others elsewhere may curse our recent past, you, O Adjaria, cannot imitate them. Despite the unforgettable pains left by the 1930s, here in our district many good things, nationally ennobling, cultural-revolutionary, and, I would say, Georgian deeds have been accomplished. This must be perceived and properly appreciated.

Today every village has a house of culture, a club, and a library. You will not find a family that does not have Georgian books. Today, Adjaria, you are among the leaders among Georgian lands in terms of your material wellbeing, your education and culture.

One well-known Russian writer, a friend of mine, told me recently when I showed him around our villages and invited him into people's homes, that Adjaria is just too Georgian. My guest had thought that since we have autonomy, everything here ought to be different, distinct from Georgian. So I tried to show him the real state of affairs.

I know that because of this autonomy, sometimes, here and there, in the capital of the USSR or in the fraternal Soviet republics, serious errors are made in regard to Adjaria. People think that there is even an Adjarian language, and this is exasperating.

I remember appearing on Lvov television a few years back. It was a live broadcast. Georgian Culture Days were underway in the Ukraine at the time. At one point, I informed viewers that I, like them, am the son of a region which had been restored to the mother country after long separation. Like you, I said, I retained my native Georgian language even under centuries of domination by foreigners. After the show, a local poet burst into the studio, embraced me excitedly, and thanked me because my remarks had saved him from making a shameful error. He said that since Adjaria has autonomy he thought it must have its own language too. And he had appended this information to some of my verses which he had translated and were to appear in the newspaper the next day. But when he heard my remarks, he understood everything, ran to the printing press, and corrected things just in time.

It goes without saying that at one time, perhaps, this administrative status played a certain positive role in the national or economic-cultural advancement of this tragically fated Georgian district, in thrall to the ways and customs of an alien religion. It seems, however, that this form of government has outlived its usefulness; instead of benefits it sometimes causes a number of misunderstandings concerning our culture's progress based on the Georgian language.

We, your native sons, are well aware of this, O Adjaria, and some time ago we brought it out at nationwide discussions... "Everything takes time," we were told.

Sometimes I feel like saying that Adjaria's history can be read in our mountains and valleys, in our land. It is sufficient just to list the names of places, and the ancient Georgianness of this country, of its whole history, is clear to see.

Is any other proof needed of your Georgianity?!

The sad thing is that in your cities, like everywhere else in our country, some of the best main streets are disfigured by the names of persons who are cursed today. Some of them ought to be changed immediately. Some of

our thousand-year-old bridges and other monuments bear the name of Tamar. Why can't one of Batumi's major streets, whose present name is to be replaced, be called Tamar Street?

You, O Adjaria, are infinitely grateful to everyone who is fighting to save your unique environment and ecology. Georgian writers were the first to raise their voices in your

defense. The oil refinery must be closed down. The indiscriminate felling of your wonderful forests must cease. O my Adjaria, you should be declared a natural preserve.

Yes, Georgian writers have always championed you and led the way. The whole Georgian intelligentsia, the whole Georgian people, my Adjaria, are on your side, are your protectors. For you are Georgia herself!

**Critic Rassadin Blasts Writers' Union
Conservatives**

18000594 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 3 Feb 89 p 2

[Interview with Stanislav Rassadin by E. Skulskaya:
"Gulpers of Air"; time and place not specified]

[Excerpt] [Skulskaya] Not long ago, after a 25-year interval, a literary evening featuring you was held in Moscow. Which of the questions you were asked seemed to you most characteristic of today?

[Rassadin] I was asked who would win—Bondarev or decency? I answered that Bondarev would triumph, while decency would console itself with the fact that it and Bondarev are incompatible.

Here decency is always ready to take consolation from precisely this sort of thing. For example, when they repealed the decree concerning the journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD, respected literary men shed grateful tears on the pages of the press. But as for me, I see how many people wanted a new decree concerning the whole arsenal of today's journals. No, everything is not really so wonderful. Zhdanov is dead, but his works live on. And these works will suffice for our children.

For example, some fellow called Bondarenko, first at the Plenum, and then in LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, has been busy conducting a painstaking accounting of the anti-Soviet remarks made on radio "Freedom" by the late Galich, and by the happily still living Korzhavin. And yet accusing these tormented writers who were driven out of their own country is like torturing people and then listening to ascertain if their groans are sufficiently loyal!

Or—take Soloukhin's article on Pasternak article in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA. Soloukhin addressed to Pasternak the most disgusting words imaginable. He called for expelling Pasternak from the Union, so that, needed by no one, he would rot on the trash heap. Now Soloukhin declares, alluding to the nature of those times, that he is not ashamed. At one time, as a young literary critic, I lambasted some of Soloukhin's verse. These verses (which in no way suffer from paraphrase) went like this: if, God forbid, someone else's child were to die, of course the author will not weep, he will weep only if his own child dies... Poetry is humanity's instinct of moral self-preservation—for centuries we have endeavored to rise above our blood ties. But Soloukhin is attempting to make it a matter of family interest.

There are no end of examples. They restored Pasternak and Galich to the Union—and were satisfied. They did not feel ashamed, as if they had totally exculpated their guilt. And yet they somehow failed to raise their ears to the heavens to find out if Boris Leonidovich wanted to

create as a poet under the direction of Yegor Isayev, who is in charge of poetry for the Union, or to write prose under Peter Proskurin, who heads up the Union's prose!

[Ye. Skulskaya] If I remember correctly, you yourself recently quoted Tvardovskiy to the effect that there is no group conflict in literature—there is only the fact that some writers have read "The Captain's Daughter" and others have not...

[Rassadin] In this sense, literary conflict really does not exist. But the war goes on and on, the holy war for the right to be shameless. With what pleasure they now recall that, after all, even Tvardovskiy did not speak up for "Doctor Zhivago;" that is, they liken someone who was fighting to the last for his journal with those who eagerly wrote denunciations. And it is precisely those who make this comparison whose literary taste has now undergone a radical improvement—they simply cannot read "Children of the Arbat"—it is such a weak piece of writing. And what of the notorious letter, signed by 11 people, against NOVYY MIR! With what fury they stand up for their rectitude, their right to be shameless. I will concede that these people are sincere, and their sincerity is, perhaps, our most terrible acquisition.

Sometimes of course they too become flustered and suddenly doubt their own capacities. I remember a thoroughly amusing story that happened 20 years ago, in 1968. Tvardovskiy had already been driven from NOVYY MIR. The Central House of Literature had been permitted to hold a literary evening for Iskander. I was conducting it. Naturally, during those days, I could not help myself from first saying a few words about NOVYY MIR, about how some time in the future we would understand what a spiritual event it had been in our lives. Then I began to introduce Iskander and said something like the following: why do I need to introduce Fazil Iskander to you; after all, it is not as if you had intended to come to an evening with Feliks Chuyev or Mikhail Alekseyev and ended up here by mistake—you yourselves know everything I have to say. These were completely innocent words, without even much claim to wit, but the audience burst into laughter. And these trivial words, expanded upon, and added to, fleshed out with details of almost legendary boldness, spread all over Moscow. I was called in to the secretariat of the Writers Union. Before me, a mere boy, sat people adorned with gray hair and decorated with orders. Even Mikhail Alekseyev came in, feeling no compunction about standing up for his impugned honor. And I sat there and thought: what are they making such a fuss about, why are they so upset? They have closed down our best journal, they occupy all the official posts, they have a free hand. But no, an audience laughed at some bit of nonsense and they grow uneasy..

[Skulskaya] In a recent issue of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, Vasil Bykov wrote that even today the Writers Union remains, first and foremost, a punitive organization...

[Rassadin] Yes, when the Union was established, everyone rejoiced, finally the absolute power of the Russian Association of Proleterian Writers would come to an end. But Stalin had simply resorted to one more device for performing negative selection among the intelligentsia. We simply did everything ourselves—we denounced ourselves, humiliated ourselves, refused to publish ourselves, prevented ourselves from living.

At some point Mayakovskiy, addressing Shalyapin in verse, announced that he who does not sing with us, is against us. Indeed, first there was the fight against those who were against us. And then the fight began against those who simply sing. And even today, many would like the singers to be silent.

[Skulskaya] Do you believe in the sincerity of those who today are repenting in public?

[Rassadin] The problem of repentance, of shame is a problem common to all nationalities. But I am Russian and I will speak first and foremost about my own nationality. The tragedy lies in the imperialism that was foisted upon it and the fact that, for decades, a feeling of superiority was instilled in, although it, like all the other nationalities, in actuality had no rights at all. It was the "first among equals," and the "elder brother," and the savior that had to be respected and feared.

Especially feared. Once I was walking along Dublaty, where at that time there were still squirrels who had not learned to hide from people. One of them ran up the palisade and was seen by one of my countrymen passing by. For some time the two of them looked at each other, then the man went after the animal with a stick crying "Get out of here you insolent bastard!" You understand, he was upset by the fact that it wasn't afraid of him.

A nationality per se cannot be condemned for anything and cannot be guilty. But the best of the best, for example Academician Likhachev, are calling for universal repentance, which everyone must undergo so that everyone can be purified. All people, the whole country, all its nationalities must repent for Stalin, and for the camps, and for what happened in Czechoslovakia...

And yet, I think that the only ones capable of sincere repentance are those whose consciences have not died...

Emigre Poet Korzhavin Interviewed in Moscow
18000541 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in
Russian 15 Feb 89 p 4

[Report on statements and responses made by Naum Korzhavin, poet, by M. Semenyuk]

[Text] Evenings with the poet Naum Korzhavin have been held in Moscow recently. Ye. Yevtushenko, V. Soloukhin, V. Sokolov, K. Vanshenkin, and others have appeared together with him. Naum Korzhavin read poems which he

wrote in the Motherland and in subsequent years in emigration (he has lived in the United States for 15 years and during that time published 2 books) and responded to notes from the audience. Today we are acquainting our readers with a recording of the poets' statements and responses, made by our correspondent M. Semenyuk during these evenings. They show the complex, contradictory, and sometimes even dramatic way a poet's fate can take shape.

"My comrades in Russia consider me a man of the sixties," N. Korzhavin said in his speech. "Yes, that is in fact my generation, even though I have a very skeptical attitude toward such a division. For a generation can also be a trap; it exists for up to 25 years and then eternity begins, where all generations flow into one. Unfortunately, at first we were split up into generations very precisely. Every person remembered only his own time. Some—the calamities of collectivization, some saw 1938, and some—something else... In general all of us to some degree were archeologists of contemporary times. We unearthed something of what it seemed we should know but did not... The simplest things were very hard for us. But it is not true what the critics of a different generation, among whom are talented ones, write, that we never deviated from the ideas of the 20th Party Congress and always stood our ground. That is a lie.

"I do not know whether I am a man of the sixties or not; I began to write in the 1940s rather than the 1960s. But I always wrote what I thought needed to be written. I wrote in order to exist. Sometimes people consider it bravery when a person never renounces himself. They assert that we were always a purely political generation, that is, that we lived in a world of social illusions and that we did not travel the road to normal, natural human values. In passing I would like to note that when life contains a great deal that is modern it is also bad: it overshadows the eternal, it overshadows life. We came to this knowledge, and we did not come to it by some foppish path; we lived through every aspect. The artist should see in the contemporary moment, in the momentary, a manifestation of the eternal.

"I often see a fervent desire in young people to leap into eternity and greatness. I repeatedly encountered this in emigration. And in this sense I began to say that there were no great poets in the 19th century. They did not pass out advance notices of their greatness. It came out later that they were geniuses. In our time a style is developing which forestalls greatness and which has no aspect of eternity. This is also characteristic in part of emigration. It has given me the impression of a kind of expanded literary circle. It will be very unpleasant if the ideology, psychology, and esthetics of it, this circle, affects our reader and writer.

"We are by no means the last country in the world in poetry. We have really had very difficult lives and indeed each of us has perhaps had some ugly events in our lives. If we are speaking of me, I was a Stalinist for 3 years, and those lines of poetry which my comrades have repeatedly

quoted here are also Stalinist verses. They have simply been quoted inaccurately. Frankly speaking, I have certainly suffered for that. I am very grateful to those investigators who handled my case. They saved me, brought me out from under the gun, and sent me to exile. Many people now say this: 'Just think!' No, all of this could have ended in tragedy for me—it was a very difficult time."

"How do you evaluate the position of the third wave of emigration?" someone in the audience asked him.

"Poets are not divided, in my opinion, into waves of emigration and certainly not into the poetry of emigration and of Russia. There are only bad and good poets. In answering the question, I would like to say that the so-called emigre poetry of the third wave is not close to me in general. I like certain verses, and no more. In general," N. Korzhavin emphasized, "people do not emigrate to gain a foothold in Russian poetry. Once I was talking about that with Aleksandr Galich and we came to the conclusion that we left not in the name of our poetry but against it. Emigration is hostile to poetry. It demands an altogether different courage from the poet."

"I emigrated, and that is no heroic deed. But I feel involvement in my country: some people here need me and I need some people here. And I must live! The country must live normally and get out of all its difficulties without upheavals. In an upheaval there can be no way out. If everyone has a normal job and normal prosperity in the family, then that is everything that is inherent to Russia."

"Was your poetry always published abroad?"

"Yes, I was published. But the very fact of publication still does not mean anything. To a certain extent I am read there and I have had poetry evenings in many cities, but not that often. There are not as many readers there as in Moscow. About 500 people gathered at the evening in Boston in honor of my 60th birthday. I think that an American poet in that very Boston, that is, in his own country, would not gather such a big audience. That is a characteristic of our country. And it always will be. Some evil tongues say that it is because we have difficulties and that all our energy is poured into poetry and into all kinds of intellectual activity. I think that it was the same way in our country before the revolution and now, and I hope it always will be. As the good poet Sergey Narovchatov said: 'Those seeking abundance will never become extinct in Russia... ' Searching for the 'abundance,' searching for what is lofty—that is what poetry is.'"

"What do you think of the poetry of Brodskiy, who was awarded the Nobel Prize?"

"Brodskiy has some good poetry which I read with pleasure. But he also has some 'brilliant' verses, and I

don't like 'brilliant' verses. As for the Nobel Committee, I don't consider it competent to evaluate Russian poetry."

"Would you like to stay in Moscow?"

"Honestly speaking, I do not want to leave Moscow. And in fact I did not want to the first time either. But I have gotten old, and any great leaps are difficult for me, although I do not have a special life there."

"Generally freedom carries with it quite a few contradictions. You must remember that freedom of speech is also unfortunately freedom of stupid speech. Otherwise it cannot exist. Therefore one must think responsibly and understand life deeply. And with freedom there is often conformism: and not only before the authorities, but also, for example, before the opinion accepted in one's circle. And bad taste which becomes the standard. Therefore I want to recall these well-known words: people, I love you—be vigilant! That also applies to freedom. But in itself freedom does not give one anything and does not insure nobility. Sometimes it even insures baseness—that is the truth."

"But all the same life is life. It is always dramatic. Its problems can never be finally resolved. That is why, in my opinion, art exists. Art always struggles to revolve the eternal questions and each time in a new way, in its own way."

One of the poet's Moscow evenings was ending and the following lines he read with sadness involuntarily came to mind:

Sometimes it is light, and sometimes it is dark,
and sometimes it is night
in my window.
Every day I wake up
in an alien country,
Into an alien milieu, I gaze into
an alien distance,
I go down the stairs
into an alien life...

Lyubimov Stages Banned Play at Taganka
18000593a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 28 Feb 89 p 3

[Article by Al. Grinevich: "A Period With a Comma"]

[Text] "Life has put a period to me and I have given it a comma!" says the main hero in the tale by Boris Mozhayev "From the Life of Fedor Kuzkin." And it does turn out that life has given him a period, a heavy, true and bold one and he in response, now sighing bitterly and then joking mischievously, has given life a comma. And so ad infinitum, an uncounted number of times....

Life also put a period to the staging by the Taganka Theater of "Alive" from the story by B. Mozhayev. And more than once. The production was banned in 1968, and banned another three times. The last time in 1978 there were guidelines: take into account some 90 comments and over a period of 2 weeks rework the performance. But even this did not save "Alive." So it was given a period while the theater was given a comma and another comma.

And only 21 years later did the premier occur. A premier which became a victory and a celebration. In actuality "Alive" was living, this staging reset by Yu. Lyubimov who came a second time to Moscow to work with the theater. I feel that the most important and difficult question for the entire collective is whether the performance is not out of date as even the story was written some 10 years before its publishing, in 1957.

No! This was the verdict of the first viewers today who gave the premier an ovation and this is also what the creators themselves feel. Let us give them the floor. At a press conference held after the performance, they answered this question.

"My Kuzkin came from a kolkhoz," stated B. Mozhayev, "but just ask now whether all kolkhoz members want to work on the kolkhozes or whether they would prefer to lease the land and work it themselves? My opinion is that the surplus food requisition system is, alas, at work now. The performance was able to say this."

"I don't understand when someone says that the performance is out of date," was the opinion of Yu. Lyubimov. "A work of art cannot be out of date. And the theater is not an agitator's notebook and is not brazen current affairs journalism which by tomorrow can already be unnecessary. If I felt that the performance in any way had lost as a work of art I would not have staged it today."

The conversation was continued by the artistic leader of the theater N. Gubenko. In particular, he said:

"For now we are reticent to take up the subject of Stalin's times, the camps, all that current journalism is full of. These things require careful sincere work. In our view, they will receive their own thorough treatment only over time. But Mozhayev's prose was chosen as eternal prose, as remarkable Russian literature which has its roots in the tradition of the 19th Century...."

Yes, and to this one could add that the theater has succeeded in creating an amazing popular character. Valeriy Zolotukhin plays a wise, honest, at times mischievous, at times frankly foolish but still steadfast and principled man. He is alive! We will stand firm by this.

Films on Armenian Earthquake Planned
18000593b Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 28 Feb 89 p 3

[Interview with the Armenian Honored Artist and Film Director Ruben Gevorkyants by S. Seyranyan, Yerevan: "Tragedies and Heroism"]

[Text] The rescuers, the devastated, despairing relatives.... A familiar picture for those who saw all of this with their own eyes in Leninakan and Spitak.

[Gevorkyants] The news of the tragedy in the homeland found me in Amsterdam where I was participating in an international film festival," said the artistic leader of the Armenfilm Documentary Films Association, the Armenian Honored Artist and Film Director Ruben Gevorkyants. "I immediately got in touch with home and learned that literally in several hours all our cameramen had left for the disaster area. Only later did they admit that during the first few hours they were unable to work so strong was the impact. As a total our association up to the present has taken 20,000 m of film.

[Seyranyan] Naturally, this material must be studied and edited and, we are hoping, will be the basis for films.

[Gevorkyants] Yes, of course. We are working on two feature-length films on the earthquake. The first has been tentatively titled "Diary" and the title itself dictates the form of presenting the material. The screen will show now only or even, it might be said, not so much the destroyed towns and villages but primarily the people with their pain and experiences. The base and temporal will encounter the elevated and heroic. Such is life.

The second feature film which we are now filming has a working title of "Testing." This is a joint work of Armenfilm with the Risk Association of the Central Documentary Films Studio and the international film association headed by Yulian Semenov. In this film through the prism of a concrete fact, the earthquake, we will emerge in the theme of mercy. In the film which I am making with the participation of E. Matevosyan, well-known foreign figures will also appear including the prominent fighter for negro rights, Jesse Jackson. A preliminary agreement has been obtained for the participation in the film of Alla Pugacheva, Charles Aznavour, Stevie Wonder and Michael Jackson with their own specially written songs. I am planning that woven just as organically into the fabric of the film will be the verses of the great medieval Armenian poet Grigor Narkatsi as well as new works by the composers A. Shnitke and A. Terteryan. Filming, in addition to our country, will also be carried out in the United States, Israel and Italy. The leitmotiv of the film is that after the earthquake in Armenia, mankind as it were suddenly grew wiser. And under the impact of an understanding of this, the political maneuverings and all sorts of dubious games retreated into the background. The future of mankind lies in unity.

Moreover, we are working on a whole series of films directly relating to the earthquake. This includes the film "Epicenter" about the first secretary of the Spitakskiy Party Raykom, Norik Muradyan, who lost ten relatives under the ruins of the earthquake. Before these tragic events, we had been making a film about him entitled "Master of the Tale." The picture was good and optimistic but then life itself shattered the mood, adding a bitter continuation to it.

The film "Misak" is about Leninakan and the First Secretary of the Party Gorkom Misak Mkrtchyan in whom the national tragedy brought out new qualities. It is seemingly the same subject but a different viewpoint and, naturally, the film should be different.

[Seyranyan] The disaster, particularly one of such a scale, has moved into the forefront films and subjects which, naturally, could have been predicted by no one. Certainly you must have an approved plan of subjects....

[Gevorkyants] Actually, if such a thing had happened just several years ago we would scarcely have been able to film one-quarter of what we did. Now we have been granted complete creative independence and this made it possible for us to organize the work under emergency conditions as we ourselves wanted. Incidentally, filming in the disaster area often without sleep and rest was carried out not only by us but also by our colleagues from Armenian television and documentary filmmakers from Moscow, Leningrad, Georgia and Moldavia. May I express sincere gratitude for this.

[Seyranyan] To what was said by Ruben Gevorkyants let us add that he turned over the entire amount of \$2,000 received along with the first prize of the Amsterdam International Film Festival (for the film "Islands") to the victim's aid fund.

Ukrainian Film Union Chief Critically Views Culture Ministry Control

18000566 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 21 Feb 89 p 4

[Interview with M. Belikov, first secretary of the board of the Ukrainian Cinematographers' Union, by correspondent O. Gusev: "Reorganization and the Price of 'Prestige'"]

[Text] What did the film makers of the Ukraine get out of their union with the republic's Ministry of Culture?

In January the management of the Kiev Film Studio imeni A. Dovzhenko got some highly unpleasant news: of the 500,000 rubles that was supposed to be given them for development of their facilities, the UkSSR Ministry of Culture had allocated the studio only 87,000.

[Gusev] "When will the rest come (if it will come at all)?" With this question I began my interview with M. Belikov, candidate for USSR people's deputy and first secretary of the board of the UkSSR Cinematographers' Union.

[Belikov] Let me note that such figures are already beginning to measure the "prestige" of the superior organization with which we were integrated, contrary to both our hard-won model of soviet film making and to common sense. There are facts associated with the introduction of patently unjustified adjustments in the republic film lending plan. Attempts have already been made to stop the screening of bold, highly socially relevant films made by Ukrainian documentary makers "Microphone," "Wall," and "The Truth Close-Up"

[Gusev] Such attempts are familiar from the stagnant years of our film, are they not?

[Belikov] I am convinced that during the days when the financial plan was in trouble there was no discussion of propaganda for Ukrainian films, including films with the stamp of the republic's studio, not only in the ministry offices, but even at the level of the rayon film lending service. Their concern here with extracting money at any price, has demonstrated, not for the first time, the continued vitality of pre-perestroika management methods. This vitality also made itself felt when two chief committees responsible for the Ukrainian film industry were established within the UkSSR Ministry of Culture and individuals with no specialized education were appointed to head them. There are no film makers among the leadership of the Ministry of Culture of the republic. Perhaps, this is why the film that won the grand prize at the Cannes Film Festival, "Legend of Narayame," was banned in the Bobrinskiy rayon of the Kirovograd oblast.

[Gusev] This means that the methods of authoritarian management are still alive?

[Belikov] Unfortunately so. But our film makers understand the irreversibility of the foundations laid at the 5th Congress of the USSR Cinematographers Union, and today decisive measures are being taken to oppose this outmoded practice. Thus, the Cinematographers Union of the republic has developed a document, "Major conditions for putting the Ukrainian film industry on a full cost accounting basis." Currently the Ukrainian film industry contributes 80 million rubles in gross income annually to the local budget, while the local budget returns to it 50 million rubles in the form of a subsidy for maintaining the film network. Analysis shows that this kind of financial environment is not conducive to putting the film industry on a cost accounting basis, but simply leads to impoverishment of the studios and film networks.

[Gusev] Where's the way out?

[Belikov] Today the film industry is an extremely complex industry, which requires extremely serious consideration. Since the structure of the two chief committees of the republic's Ministry of Culture are not capable of supporting the development of the film industry in the Ukraine, the UkSSR Cinematographers' Union proposes the establishment of "Ukrainfilm," a state republic association operating on the basis of total cost accounting and self financing. Currently the chief committees for production of film are based exclusively on a budget system, which acts to impede the movement of the studios toward financial independence based on cost accounting. In our view the "Ukrainfilm" association would be able to overcome this contradiction, if it is established as a part of the UkSSR Council of Ministers and not the republic's Ministry of Culture. Only then will it truly become possible to pursue an integrated policy with respect to both creation and production of films. This association would be fully capable of fulfilling and financing republic and state orders.

[Gusev] Why are such orders essential?

[Belikov] Let us agree that today we must attach another meaning to the concept of "state orders." If in the past such orders were given out to ensure the treatment of certain themes and topics, now they should be directed at solving creative and aesthetic problems, and encouraging certain tendencies in the development of our national film industry, and the work of talented young people. Many of the regions of our republic have a varied cultural heritage. Recently, in response to an initiative of the creative community of the Western Ukraine within the UkSSR Cinematographers Union, the "Galfilm" studio was established. Here is an instance where a republic state order would have been very appropriate. But for the time being the UkSSR Cinematographers Union, with the support of the Lvovsk obkom of the USSR Communist Party, is working to organize the new studio, since the staff of the republic Ministry of Culture, shrugged their shoulders in perplexity, expressing doubt in the desirability of this act. Could this have been because "Galfilm" was deliberately not placed under their control?

[Gusev] And yet, when it comes to financing film productions, don't state organizations still have priority?

[Belikov] Why? There exist other techniques for providing resources. Within the UkSSR Cinematographers' Union we are creating a joint stock company to develop and produce propaganda for the republic's film industry. Its members, aside from the Cinematographers' Union, will be the Kiev film copying factory, the "Kinotsentr" association, and other enterprises of the city and republic. The Kiev joint stock association is a completely new administrative-economic form of activity, combining the capabilities of a cost-accounting-based state enterprise and of nontraditional sources of financing.

[Gusev] But how will it be monitored?

[Belikov] Are you talking about censors? I believe that creative associations and studios should be the ones to

launch and the ones to pass on the acceptability of a picture. Only one principle is required: we must rely wholly on our constitutional standards to determine what should be permitted and what should be banned.

[Gusev] What is preventing the sector from adopting cost accounting today?

[Belikov] The rural network of the film lending organization in the Ukraine loses 42 million rubles [per year?]. Population density has decreased sharply and continues to fall. We see a real way out of this blind alley through the establishment, first, of mobile movie theaters, and, ultimately in the future, through replacement of the film network with a video network. The first pilot project has had promising results: in the Chernigov oblast they have begun to turn out videobusses. The shows on wheels that these vehicles make possible have generally been highly evaluated. However, the ministry has not decided the issue of the need to restructure the film network into a video network. What is more, the 1.5 million rubles allocated for the development of the film network were, by a decision of the Ministry of Culture, distributed among the cultural directorates.

[Gusev] Doesn't it seem to you that many years of discussion of the new model, of the principles for stimulating the economy, and of the interrelationships among the subdivisions have not been backed up by creative achievements?

[Belikov] Not completely. No matter what, a firm economic base is still necessary for organization of the creative process. And as for achievements, recently serious films have appeared, which have attracted notice even beyond our republic. Among them are prize winners in all-Union and international festivals. Competition has begun to appear in the studios. The expectation of the future institution of cost-accounting has acted as a "barrier" against directors who were recently well-known for the social aspects of their work, but who are artistically weak. This is why the creation of independent critical associations is of primary importance to us. But for the time being the attempt to form such an association under the name of "Talisman" is meeting with difficulty, and not only in the Studio imeni A. Dovzhenko.

[Gusev] What are you working on now?

[Belikov] I have given over my authority as the secretary of the board of the UkSSR Cinematographers' Union to the secretariat of the board and taken creative leave. I am busy with preparations to shoot a film about the Chernobyl tragedy. I wrote the film script with O. Prikhodko, and now we are looking at the location and casting actors. And our Cinematographers' Union is attempting to seek and find individuals, whose art will serve perestroika in the broadest sense. Today, this is the surest road, which in principle obviates the need for various types of bureaucratic fellow-travelers and superstructures.

Deputy Supreme Court Chairman on Desired Legal Reforms

18000621a Moscow OGONEK in Russian
No 8, 4-11 Mar 89 pp 4-6

[Interview with Sergey Ivanovich Gusev, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, conducted by OGONEK correspondent Mikhail Korchagin: "The Supreme Court: A Jurist's New View on Old Justice Problems; A State Truly Governed by Law—The View From the Top of the Judicial Pyramid"]

[Text] [Korchagin] Your court is in a way the Mount Olympus of our country's entire judicial system. But a legal reform would of course affect the USSR Supreme Court most of all. What changes do you foresee in this regard?

[Gusev] You are tempting me with Greek mythology. As you know, Mount Olympus was a sacred mountain, the dwelling place of the gods. Unfortunately we are not gods. Until recently our Supreme Court held the unnatural position of a "connecting link" within the system of law enforcement organs. Only the restructuring that is now getting underway has changed that situation.

In a state governed by law our court should truly be, as you noted, at the top of the system of law enforcement organs both in form and in substance (first among equals). Indeed, the court is the most democratic part of the entire system of law enforcement organs. In contrast to investigative organs, for example, it is open to citizens; it administers justice publicly, openly and in plain view of all. The Supreme Court is the USSR's highest judicial organ and thus the last court of appeal. That means that it has the final word in a legal conflict.

[Korchagin] I think the members of the Supreme Court have a great interest in the form taken by the new USSR Law on the Supreme Court. What new things do you envision it containing?

[Gusev] Above all I would like to see the USSR Supreme Court elected by the Congress of People's Deputies. We have proposed this idea and defended it before the Commission on Legislative Proposals. But that proved futile. The current law was passed in 1979, a time when it was arrogantly assumed that everything it contained was close to the communist ideal and did not need to be changed. Yet changes should have been made, especially since the new law was virtually identical to the old statute on the USSR Supreme Court passed in 1956 (!)...

[Korchagin] Sergey Ivanovich, there are plans to establish a Constitutional Review Committee [Komitet konstitutsionnogo nadzora] in the near future. In all the countries which are highly developed in a legal sense (e.g. the United States, Canada or the FRG) that type of review function is performed by supreme courts. Why has this important function not been placed under the

jurisdiction of the USSR Supreme Court? Because essentially what is happening is that a new government agency with another large staff is being created. Does that make any sense?

[Gusev] Unfortunately you are too late in asking that question. The law concerning the establishment of a Constitutional Review Committee was passed on 1 December 1988. Now the important issue is a different one: what will this committee be like, what powers will it have? All we know is that it will be elected for a 10-year term from among specialists in the fields of politics and law (it will have a chairman, a deputy chairman and 21 members, including a representatives from each of the union republics).

Well, that is an innovation; I cannot think of anything analogous to it. But it is important that the committee in no case be transformed into a consultative organ dealing with the adoption of new legislation. The committee should not participate in the drafting of new laws which the committee itself will later have the responsibility of reviewing. Otherwise what we will have is a committee reviewing its own work.

Despite the impending establishment of the aforementioned committee we have expressed our opinion that a number of constitutional review functions should be assigned to the USSR Supreme Court because the committee will simply not be capable of (nor will it have a right to) determine the constitutionality of a given department's legal "masterpiece" in every legal dispute. In such cases our court should be the legal arbiter.

[Korchagin] Today our country's courts are devoting a great deal of attention to the rehabilitation of persons who suffered from Stalinist repressions. What role does the USSR Supreme Court play in this process?

[Gusev] Our court works together very closely with the commission established by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. Hundreds of thousands of people who were unjustly convicted and repressed in a non-judicial manner (without trial or investigation) have been rehabilitated. Much work remains to be done, since the backlog of cases is still large. In order to speed up the rehabilitation process a special resolution has been adopted. This act repeals all decisions handed down by the so-called "special meetings" and "troikas." This is an extremely timely act. Without it rehabilitation of those who were unjustly repressed would drag on for decades... Incidentally, the USSR Supreme Court has already touched on this matter in its proposals submitted to directive organs and in the party press (see the journal PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN, No 9, 1988).

[Korchagin] Sergey Ivanovich, let us touch once again on that difficult, terrible time. Unfortunately it was not just the NKVD that participated in the repression of Soviet

citizens and falsified investigative materials. Reading articles one encounters one name almost exclusively—Ulrich, chairman of the Military Board. Yet there were also others.

[Gusev] Quite frankly, you have touched on the most painful page in the history and work of the USSR Supreme Court. Indeed, Ulrich was an odious figure. In those years the Military Board, a part of the USSR Supreme Court, was essentially an autonomous division, a "state within the state." Ulrich, the ruler of that state, communicated directly with Stalin, reporting everything to him and making appropriate suggestions, since the repressive apparatus of that time was under the latter's constant supervision. This once again proves that Stalin must have known what was being done by the state's Supreme Court.

But Ulrich sat on the bench rubber-stamping fabricated convictions along with other people whose names are known to few. I can name the members of the Military Board of the 1930's, 1940's and early 1950's, as that is no secret. There exist openly publishable documents giving these names, with which people have long had a chance to acquaint themselves.

The second session of the USSR Supreme Court on 17 August 1938 elected 45 USSR Supreme Court members, including the members of the Military Board: L. D. Detistov, D. Ya. Kandybin, F. A. Klemen, I. O. Matulevich, A. M. Orlov, M. G. Romanchev, A. G. Suslin, I. M. Zaryanov, V. V. Bukanov and A. A. Cheptsov.

There is no information available concerning the composition and size of the Military Board during the infamous year 1937. The USSR Supreme Court did not hold any elections from 1940 through 1946. This was as a result of the war. But even after this time the composition of the court, which pleased Stalin, remained unchanged. On 15 March 1946 only one new member was elected: V. V. Syuldin. Ulrich and many other members of the Military Board did not survive the 1951 elections. Ulrich himself fell into disfavor with Stalin, who had him removed from his post. Ulrich was transferred to a different job and soon thereafter died unexpectedly. We have no information to indicate that any of the former members from those years are still alive. Yet the actions of each one should be subjected to analysis. We must take another look at the archives. In any event, up until 1953 all of them were something akin to hostages on the judicial bench.

[Korchagin] What is your opinion of the death penalty in our state? Is it a justified measure in the fight against crime?

[Gusev] In principle I favor repeal of the death penalty. The effectiveness of this measure is virtually nil. The number of murders committed with aggravating circumstances in this country remains large. The road to the elimination of crime will be long, and this matter is

extremely complex. I agree that we should not take the life of an individual who has overstepped the bounds of the law. Particularly as that life was not granted by the court. The question is a different one: is it humane in regard to our society to make a murderer, a rapist or a person with sadistic inclinations a full member of our state with all rights? Would that be humane in regard to the family of the person who might be killed by that very same criminal after he has served his time? Would that be humane in regard to society at large? That is the question.

[Korchagin] But there are crimes and then there are crimes.

[Gusev] I agree. That is why the draft USSR Basic Criminal Legislation would abolish the use of the death penalty for economic crimes (particularly large-scale embezzlement, bribery and so on). To all appearances the death penalty for premeditated murder with aggravating circumstances, rape of a minor and certain state crimes will not be abolished in the foreseeable future.

[Korchagin] Sergey Ivanovich, are you not disturbed by the length of time that suspects may be kept in custody? Sometimes persons under investigation spend several years in jail! Not to mention prison conditions. How can we talk about legal protection of suspects today when many people, seeing no other way out of prison except getting convicted and getting their sentence over as quickly as possible, actually incriminate themselves?

[Gusev] I am not only disturbed, I am outraged. When we imprison a suspect for a long period of time (which period should according to law not exceed nine months, with the possibility of an extension being imposed by the USSR Procurator General) we forget about the presumption of innocence, the intent of which is common knowledge.

Basically an innocent person can be kept in custody for a long period of time under conditions which are far from "homelike." (I say innocent because only the court can pronounce that individual a "criminal.") But do we have a right to deprive him of contact with family members or of socially useful employment? For this person is not yet a criminal. Therefore I feel that it is absolutely essential that we change the conditions of imprisonment in investigative isolation cells and make those conditions **approximate human conditions**. We must make this detainment more humane so that people do not lose their human aspect and dignity.

Now a word about the length of detention. Most often violation of this is the result of overly hasty arrests, especially in connection with economic crimes, including those committed by public officials. Often in these cases arrest and detention in an investigative isolation cell under conditions that are far from normal are in themselves means of extracting testimony. That is, arrests are used to obtain evidence. You will agree that

this seems backwards. In actuality things should be the other way around: one should obtain the appropriate evidence first. It is no means a rare occurrence for a person to be held in investigative custody for more than nine months.

[Korchagin] What are the reasons for that?

[Gusev] There are several: the poor training of a number of investigators who make up the so-called investigative brigades, a lack of appropriate investigation planning, inadequate joint training of investigators and operational personnel, and megalomania—striving for personal glory and highly publicized cases. All these flaws as well as lengthy detention of suspects are concealed behind demagogic phrases about the need to intensify the fight against crime and references to the particularly complex nature of a given case. Yes, there are complicated cases, and they should be handled properly and sent to trial in a timely manner.

[Korchagin] It is of course time to put a stop to red tape. But what specific ways of doing that can you see?

[Gusev] Above all placing extensions of suspect custody under the court's control. The USSR Supreme Court should be the only one with a right to extend the period of detainment beyond nine months. There is another solution, one to which I think specialists in trial law will object. I am referring to limitations on the extent of investigation with regard to especially dangerous criminals (recidivists, bandits and particularly large-scale thieves). These cases require a rapid response: the main incidents of the crime should be investigated quickly so that the heads of the USSR Procuracy can send the case to trial immediately. They will decide the fate of the other, less important incidents of the crime within the framework of criminal trial law, up to and including termination of the investigation. Of course it is not desirable that these incidents not be investigated at all. But since we are talking about staying within time limits I see this as one solution.

[Korchagin] What you have told us regarding investigative custody and time limits involuntarily brings to mind the role of attorneys, who are often quixotic figures in court cases. Would it be appropriate to get them involved at the very start of the investigation, at the point where a suspect is deprived of liberty and indicted?

[Gusev] I would not say that they are quixotic figures in court. The legal profession is becoming more active, and that is one of the hallmarks of restructuring. Attorneys are establishing their own professional association, and it would be good for that association to become an important, respected part of the USSR Union of Jurists which we hope to establish soon. The Supreme Court at least will be one of its founders.

As for the use of an attorney from the beginning of an investigation, I feel that it is essential that he be present with the suspect during interrogation. Then an attorney could rightly be termed a "defender," as he is popularly known. This should be done as of the time of arrest, since violations of the law most often occur during the earliest stages of an investigation.

[Korchagin] Our legal ignorance is so great that sometimes a suspect does not even know that he or she has a right to the services of an attorney. Can our state be a state governed by law in the fullest sense, given the public's current legal illiteracy?

[Gusev] I would not put it so harshly. We have a lack of legal information rather than legal illiteracy. And it results from our inability to propagandize the law via the press, radio and television. How can we talk about propaganda for the law when the television show "Che-lovek i zakon" [The Law and the Individual] is only half an hour long and is only on once or twice a month? And the "roundtable" discussions are nothing to speak of. The Moscow TV channel probably devotes more time to legal subjects than the rest. Yet overall the situation is abnormal. So the ball is now in the mass media's court. OGONEK is no exception in this regard.

Merely printing negative articles will not change the situation. We need a weekly legal newspaper. A magazine is desperately needed.

There are cases of a suspect actually not knowing that he or she has a right to an attorney. Though it is true that the number of attorneys in our state is pitiful. There were considerably more in backward czarist Russia. If I am not mistaken there are only 25,000 attorneys in our entire huge country today...

[Korchagin] Interesting. Why is that?

[Gusev] Because the role of the attorney, like the role of the court itself, has been deemphasized since Stalin's time. Read the stenographic accounts of statements by attorneys Komodov, Kaznacheyev, Braude and others at the trials of 1937-38 and you will find that most of their speeches were of an accusatory rather than a defensive nature. Priority was given to the penal apparatus rather than to the courts and the defense. We know what were the consequences. But old stereotypes are tenacious. It is no coincidence that in the UzSSR 445 people (!) have been unjustly convicted and their convictions later overturned in the past three-and-a-half years alone. The state had to make restitution, paying the victims approximately 800,000 rubles.

Incidentally, even today the press prints some articles by certain practicing jurists in the procuratorial/investigative apparatus who are attempting to place the blame for their own failings and incompetence on attorneys and the courts.

[Korchagin] In your opinion do we need trial by jury in this country? And could the quality of the proceedings be improved in principle through a change in the number of persons on the trial board?

[Gusev] To begin with I would like to stress the fact that I do not reject out of hand the idea of establishing a system of trial by jury in our country. There were courts of this type in czarist Russia, and they exist in the United States and in a number of other countries around the world. Insofar as I am familiar with jury trials in the United States and with the opinion of their theoreticians and practicing jurists I daresay that a fair half of them feel that a "crown" court, i.e. a court of professionals, would be preferable. Debate on this issue continues to this day. Incidentally, the discussion of whether or not we need this is belated. As you are aware, decisions have already been made concerning people's assessors, who will be placed on a par with judges.

[Korchagin] Nevertheless, could you tell us about the way a jury trial functions, using one of those countries as an example?

[Gusev] Certainly. The jurors (12 people) in an American court, for example, decide only the question of guilt. In the end the sentence is still handed down by one individual, the judge, and it is he who conducts the trial. True, Americans who are proponents of trial by jury say that their system is more democratic on account of the number of jurors, who are in a better position to view a case in an unbiased light than the judge, who represents the state. In addition the judge does not bear responsibility for the jurors' verdict, and therefore the state does not bear such responsibility either (i.e. this underscores the greater independence of the court). Furthermore the feeling in the United States is that this results in professional and material savings since the state does not need to have as many judges, who as a result are very highly paid. People also say this protects the judge from the "temptation" of bribery, since he does not participate in the jurors' debate and does not know their verdict in advance. I think we should not reject other countries' experience, instead adopting the best of their practices.

[Korchagin] We receive a great deal of mail concerning acquittals. Is the percentage of such verdicts high if one considers the total number of sentences handed down by courts? Often some courts regard this kind of verdict as highly irregular. Why do you think that is true?

[Gusev] If there were no acquittals there would be no justice. The absence of acquittals would give courts the overtone of penal institutions. There is a reason why Article 309 of the RSFSR makes special provision for acquittal, to be handed down under three circumstances: if it has not been proven that a crime has occurred; if the actions of the accused do not constitute a criminal act; or

if it cannot be proven that the accused was a participant in the commission of a crime. Acquittals are normal. Yet at times they are regarded as something out of the ordinary...

[Korchagin] Why? For the law, as you have just said, makes provision for this type of verdict.

[Gusev] Yes. But the law does not make provision for something else: ambition and offense on the part of investigative organs. Yet the only ones they should feel offended by are themselves. It is important to behave correctly, especially with regard to an opponent like the court. One can disagree within the framework of a trial, but when the USSR Supreme Court has made its decision superfluous discussion should come to an end.

Often the courts, which are under the same "roof" and in the same party organization as the procuracy, want to avoid a conflict. Because what does an acquittal mean to the procuracy, for instance? Above all it is an admission that the investigation was groundless; it means a failure in the work of the procurator in charge of the case. Therefore sometimes the court will either allow one charge against the accused to stand even though his guilt has not been established, or else will unjustifiably return the case to the procuracy for additional investigation. The latter option allows the case to be dropped quietly, behind closed doors.

It is not half as bad if the accused was not arrested prior to the trial and is acquitted; in that case it can be said that no error was made, simply that the investigator was "overzealous" and thus the court acquitted the accused. Thoughtless, premature arrests should be grounds for serious penalties. I recall that the CPSU Central Committee has issued a resolution on this matter requiring that persons who arrest citizens unjustly be barred from practice. That resolution has not been rescinded, but some people seem to have forgotten about it.

But I do feel that the ice has begun to thaw. Whereas in 1983 the courts handed down 946 acquittals, this figure was 2,206 in 1987 and 1,171 during the first six months of 1988. The total number of persons pronounced not guilty by the courts in 1983 was 1,515, 4,771 in 1987 and 2,107 during the first six months of 1988.

[Korchagin] Often a just acquittal can still be blocked by "telephone law" which, I think, would be difficult to abolish even with new legislation. The people who administer that kind of law are hard to catch. It is especially hard to fight them out in the "provinces." Obviously it would be hard to exert pressure on the USSR Supreme Court, which is at the top of the judicial pyramid. Yet still... Do you really never experience that kind of undue pressure?

[Gusev] Fortunately the USSR Supreme Court does not recognize "telephone law." As for judges at the rayon and oblast level, we have still not overcome instances of

interference in trials. I expect that as the legal reform is implemented and the principle of judges' independence is reinforced this atavistic phenomenon will disappear. Though I do not think that that will happen anytime soon...

[Korchagin] In addition to "telephone law" there is also another means of influencing the verdict handed down by your colleagues. That is through the press. One does not have to look very far to find examples of this. For example, A. Ya. Sukharev, Procurator General, appealed to the USSR Supreme Court in regard to the so-called "Khint Case." Your colleagues had not even examined his appeal or handed down any verdict when PRAVDA went and published an article describing the extent of I. Khint's guilt. Without going into that case (to which our editorial board will return following a decision in the case) I would like to hear your opinion of pretrial articles like that.

[Gusev] Generally speaking the greatest danger from articles of that sort is that they will inflame public opinion. On this point A. Koni once aptly noted that there is public opinion, then there are public passions... It is these passions which are stirred up by pretrial articles praising the court's sentence in advance. For only the court has a right to call the accused a criminal.

[Korchagin] Sergey Ivanovich, let us fantasize a bit. How do you envision the Supreme Court of the future?

[Gusev] Today I see the future USSR Supreme Court more clearly and in a better light. Above all the USSR Supreme Court should be unwaveringly strong and authoritative. I envision it in the foreseeable future as a court with broader powers than it has today. What do I mean by that? Firstly, it should have a right to hear any case.

Secondly, any citizen in any union republic should have an opportunity to appeal his or her case to the USSR Supreme Court when all the judicial avenues of the republic Supreme Court have been exhausted. There is still a "restrictive" rule in effect which forbids a citizen to appeal a case to our court until such time as that citizen is refused an opportunity to appeal the case by an appropriate resolution of a republic supreme court's presidium or plenum (with the exception of cases which are heard in a republic supreme court's first instance. We have a right to hear those cases.). Today, whether we like it or not, the right to justice in our state's highest court is being violated when the heads of republic courts turn down these citizens' appeals. Localistic tendencies also play a certain role in this. And we need to take a serious look at this question from the standpoint of interethnic relations as well.

The functioning of the USSR Supreme Court Plenum also needs improvement. I hope that in the Supreme Court of the future decisions will be made by a two-thirds majority rather than by a simple majority. And

there should be a roll call vote on specific cases so that not a single person voting can hide behind a unanimous majority. You might say that these are the pieces that I would like to add to the law of the future.

Yet the most important aspect of the future USSR Supreme Court's work will be adherence to the principle of separation of powers as underscored by M. S. Gorbachev: "...Let the laws, I repeat, be written by our parliament, let the government have the executive power, and let the courts administer justice."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Ogonek", 1989.

Lawyer Rebuts Arguments Favoring Abolition of Death Penalty

18000620 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 4 Mar 89 First Edition p 3

[Article by S. Samoylov, lawyer, Moscow, under rubric "It is Always Necessary to Be Merciful": "Let the Sword of Damocles Do Its Job"]

[Text] A recent broadcast in the "Public Opinion" television series enabled people to be reconvinced that the draft version of the Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation actually is being discussed currently by everyone. And probably the hottest disputes have been caused by the problem of the death penalty. G. Frank's documentary film "Supreme Court," which has attracted vast audiences in motion picture theaters throughout the country, once again raised the burning question: do the state and society have the right, when protecting themselves against criminal encroachments, to deprive a person of his chief property and wealth—his life?

The impression is developing that, by publishing the materials linked with the discussion of the Fundamentals of Legislation, the press is more in sympathy with the authors who categorically are against the death penalty and in general for milder punishments.

It is typical that these recommendations proceed chiefly from legal theoreticians. But do they reflect society's mood as a whole? The procuracy agencies, for example, receive a large number of recommendations from the public, but practically no one asks for the showing of mercy to criminals who are preventing Soviet citizens from living and working.

Recently the All-Union Scientific-Research Institute on Problems of Reinforcing Legality and Law and Order had a discussion of the draft version of the Fundamentals with the participation of a group of its authors. They had a difficult time. The lawyers participating in the discussion sharply criticized the draft for its being obviously unrealistic, and for its bias toward those who break the law.

But even the authors of the draft did not find any grounds for the complete rejection of the death penalty for specific, especially heinous crimes, and limited themselves only to narrowing the sphere of application of that penalty.

One often hears that the death penalty is contrary to the very spirit of civilized society. But the level of a society's civilization has never been determined by its indulgent attitude toward criminals, since indulgence toward them is nothing else but a manifestation of cruelty to their victims.

The objection is made that if the death penalty is applied rarely, then wouldn't it be better to abolish it completely? Actually, Soviet society is striving for that. Obviously, the authors of the draft also attempted, when moving toward the narrowing of the sphere of the application of the death penalty, to reflect that directedness to a certain degree.

But the actual application should not be confused with proclaiming it in the law. Obviously, the law must reflect society's attitude to a particular criminal deed. It is another matter to determine what punishment must actually be meted out to a person who has committed an especially heinous crime. This will be decided by the court, with a consideration of all the circumstances of the case and the defendant's personality. But the threat of retribution, like the sword of Damocles, must be retained for each especially dangerous criminal. Unfortunately, the very concept of punishment as retribution has disappeared from the draft version of the Fundamentals. It is difficult to agree with this.

When defendant Mikhasevich, who killed more than 30 persons in Vitebsk Oblast several years ago, was asked by expert psychiatrists whether he would have continued committing the murders if he had been free, Mikhasevich answered in the affirmative... Why? Because, by his own admission, which was confirmed by the experts' conclusions, Mikhasevich obtained satisfaction from his foul deeds, although he was not sick in the clinical sense of the word... Of course, the murderer deserved the death penalty and it received it by a sentence meted out by the legal board for criminal affairs, USSR Supreme Court. The author of these lines, when making a statement in the legal proceeding as the state prosecutor, asked to have Mikhasevich sentenced to that measure of punishment.

One cannot fail to take into consideration the fact that Mikhasevich is not the first, and I am afraid he is not the last, monster in human guise. People like Mikhasevich exist and, when carrying out their foul deeds, count on our pity and our indulgence. Incidentally, Mikhasevich himself, in court, also asked that his life be preserved. However, could we hope that the murderer of 30 completely innocent people would be re-educated with the passage of time?

Yet another argument used by the opponents of the death penalty lies in the question: what struggle against

murders can one talk about if the state, when implementing the death penalty, itself carries out deliberate murders? Hence their conclusion that the highest measure [the death penalty] is an evil that invariably gives rise to a new evil. There is no logic to judgments such as this. Does this mean that all one has to do is abolish the death penalty and people will immediately cease committing deliberate murders? They would still continue to occur.

The exceptional measure is the countermeasure to the actions taken by dangerous criminals. Otherwise it would be necessary also to reject the humane and profoundly just right that has been firmly established in criminal legislation—the right of citizens to take the necessary steps to defend themselves, a right which, as is well known, in exceptional circumstances makes it possible, if we may speak sharply, even to kill an attacker in order to save one's own life. Well, then, are such defensive measures an evil or a good?

When, several years ago, there arose the idea of correcting the structure of measures of punishment that had developed in practice, there was no need to adopt a new law or to make any amendments in it. That is why we have the USSR Supreme Court, the USSR Procuracy, and other union law-enforcement agencies, so that, by studying and generalizing the legal-investigative practice, they can give it a correct and legal direction. Within a short period of time the percentage of persons sentenced to incarceration dropped from 70 to 30 percent. Whether this is good or bad, only time will tell. But life has already confirmed that changing the punishment practice does not require changing the law each time.

If we want to guarantee ahead of time the mildness of the sentences, then legal statistics right now, speaking frankly, do not provide any justifications for any guarantee: the courts are already acting very mildly. By examining carefully the practice that is developing, it is easy to notice the wary desire by the investigators, procurators, and judges not to attack the criminals, but, as it were, to find a way to brush them aside, to stay as far away as possible from sin...

Why this has occurred is a topic for separate and very serious discussion. But that topic, it would seem, is still linked with the problem of the "highest measure." The stability of the law is no less a blessing than its perfection.

Regulations Governing Use of Duplicating Equipment Described
18000658 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 4 Feb 89 p 4

[Unsigned article: "Illegal Literature?"]

[Text] "It is no secret that in Minsk several informal associations are 'passing around' from hand to hand various newspapers and bulletins that have been reproduced in large quantities on duplicating equipment. Are

there specific regulations for using duplicating equipment as well as making copies of documents in general?" (From letters received by the BSSR MVD).

According to the ministry's administration for preserving public order, duplicating equipment comes under the jurisdiction of ministries, departments, enterprises and institutions possessing legal status. Documents and materials from open Soviet and foreign publications as well as those pertaining to the activities of the above-mentioned organizations with legal status are copied with the permission of officials attached to these organizations. The requests of organizations other than those possessing legal status and private customers can be filled for a fixed fee. The duplication of materials is accomplished by the written permission of persons who are responsible for the use of duplicating equipment. Before material is reproduced, it is recorded in a special registry.

Former Captain of 'Admiral Nakhimov'
Interviewed at Labor Camp
18000355 Kiev *RABOCHAYA GAZETA* in Russian
27 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by O. Svishch, V. Korkodym, *RABOCHAYA GAZETA* Special Correspondents under the rubric "Rumors Are Circulating": "I Am Not Justifying My Actions"]

[Text] Much has been written in the press about the loss of the passenger ship *Admiral Nakhimov* and the legal proceedings against the perpetrators of the accident. Everyone knows that they were punished. But the other day I happened to hear that former Captain Markov apparently has already been set free. Is that really the case?

P. Voloshin, Odessa

While carrying out an editorial assignment, we visited the corrective labor colony, where the convict V.G. Markov is serving his sentence. We found him bent over the production line in one of the workshops in the industrial sector. A short time later we were talking with the former captain of the *Admiral Nakhimov*.

[Markov] I managed to avoid the ceremony of "registration", which exists among convicts—age was a determining factor. They did not suggest that I should climb into the "palm tree" (the upper bunk) and they let me have the lower bunk. I did not have a spoon and I was given one on the spot.

I have worked with metal from the very beginning of my stay here. I have bent and cut strips and worked as a welder. After eight months, I was appointed team leader in another workshop. As the saying goes, chance assisted

in this matter. I was given an assignment to make a new container, but some blueprints were missing. I had to work hard to fill the order. And the leaders appreciated this.

[Correspondents] You are the chairman of the collective's soviet at the colony. What kind of influence does the soviet have on the reeducation of the convicts?

[Markov] More and more problems concerning life at the corrective labor colony are being discussed in the soviet and subsequently passed on to the administration for consideration. This includes both the punishment for convicts, who have committed an offense, and applying for early release... The soviet exerts considerable effort so that those who end up here get started on the path of rehabilitation. Or at least so that one does not become totally corrupt. Of course, it does not always succeed. And, in my opinion, the main reason for this is that here everyone is thrown together—drug addicts, pickpockets, sexual perverts, and careless workers. Not every convict, and here it is primarily the young ones, manages to resist the "romanticism" of the zone.

[Correspondents] And how are you enduring the conditions of confinement?

[Markov] Well, how should a person feel here. I am not able to get used to this. The feeling of guilt constantly weighs upon me. As regards the conditions, it would be a sin to be offended. The diet is normal, there is white bread... If the plan is fulfilled, one might be issued 15-17 rubles worth of goods at the trade booth. Medical service is rendered when it is needed. I have already had a long meeting with my son. There are no restrictions on letters. I receive them daily. I devote my free time to reading fiction, newspapers, and magazines, anything that I can get my hands on. I am improving my knowledge of the English language.

[Correspondents] In court you admitted that you were partially at fault. Can you explain why?

[Markov] Believe me, I have had enough time to go over the tragedy hundreds of times in my mind. What should I have done, when I received the report that the cargo ship was letting me pass. The Pyotr Vasev reaffirmed this three times. It rammed into us so hard that the passenger ship instantly found itself dead in the water. I gave the order to sound the damage-control alarm and subsequently the alarm to man the lifeboats. But the assistant to the deck officer reported: the alarm system was out of order. At that time the seamen began to pass my order verbally. I did not attempt to justify my actions during the legal proceedings and I do not want to do that now. After the sentence, I felt no animosity—at the trial I saw the grief...

[Correspondents] You were sued for 40 thousand rubles...

[Markov] I have already paid part of it with my personal savings. But I continue to pay an allotment from my monthly earnings. I will mention that the sum of the lawsuit was determined by the cost of conducting emergency rescue and salvage efforts and not by the cost of the ship itself. The Admiral Nakhimov, which was launched in 1924, had been written off by the Merchant Fleet and at the time of its loss had zero value.

[Correspondents] The disaster near Novorossiysk, which claimed hundreds of human lives, attracted a great deal of attention from the press. What is your opinion of the articles on this subject?

[Markov] I have read part of the materials. Unfortunately, there are inaccuracies, and even falsehood, regarding me in them. I think this is because not a single one of the journalists talked with me. Don't be offended, but this is the reason that I did not want to talk with you at first either...

These are the answers we received to the questions in connection with P. Voloshin's letter...

Soviet Psychiatrist Interviewed on Effects of Restructuring

18300313a Moscow TRUD in Russian 3 Feb 89 p 1

[Interview with B. F. Lomov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, director of the Institute of Psychology and chairman of the Academy of Sciences Council on the Integrated Study of the Problems of Man, by V. Belitskiy, TRUD scientific reviewer: "The Personality Factor; 7th All-Union Congress of the USSR Society of Psychologists Concludes its Work"]

[Text] Probably the most complex matter in our perestroika is the restructuring of people's psychology. There is a popular slogan which states "start with yourself". But how? What must we do to rid ourselves of the burden of former notions and stereotypes, to move toward a new thinking and a new form of action? Is this indeed possible for people who are completely formed? To answer these and many other similar questions concerning the social-psychological state and the problems of society's development is impossible without the participation of those whose specialty it is to answer specifically such questions. That is, without psychologists. But do they have the answers? Are they ready to share them with all of society? All this was discussed at the Congress. Our TRUD correspondent asked USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, director of the Institute of Psychology, and chairman of the Academy of Sciences Scientific Council on the Integrated Study of the Problems of Man, Boris Fedorovich LOMOV, to tell about his work and about its significance.

[Belitskiy] Much was said at the Congress about the peculiar position of psychological science in today's

world and about the need for its rapid, top priority development. How substantiated are such claims?

[Lomov] It seemed to me that they are still somewhat weakly manifested. Evidently the humility of our colleagues is reflected here. In my opinion, we must not only speak about the inadmissible, critical backwardness of psychological science, we must shout about it. After all, no one, I believe, will deny that the most important trait of the restructuring going on in the country has become the sharp turn toward man—from the demeaning, slavish theory of "cogs" to the emancipating thesis of "man—the creator of history". It is no secret that many of those who triumphantly proclaimed "All for man!" were primarily referring to themselves.

Psychology, as a science of regularities, development and forms of mental activity, was not needed by the Administrative System. Where strict command rules there is no place for thought, study, and consideration of individuality. This was the root of all the misfortunes of our science also in the years of the cult of Stalin, as well as in the post-Stalinist, stagnant times.

Today, fortunately, we are beginning to gain an understanding of the fact that the success of measures for accelerating the country's socio-economic development depends directly upon the psychological peculiarities of the people implementing these measures. It depends on the motives for their behavior, on their needs, interests and creative capacities, on intellect and feelings, on consciousness and self awareness... All these are the factors studied by psychology, and underestimating them in making crucial decisions in any sphere inevitably leads to errors.

[Belitskiy] For example?

[Lomov] For example, the struggle against drunkenness. Of course, it had to be expanded. However, here we must necessarily take into consideration also certain habits and stereotypes in the behavior of people, traditions—including national traditions, and the possible reaction of various groups of the population... Unfortunately, the adopted legislative measures which were aggravated by thoughtless local general prohibitions led to negative consequences which were inevitable under such conditions: the increase in alcohol and drug addiction, bootlegging, cutting down of vineyards, outbreaks of speculation, and so forth. Today we must take a step backward. The number of stores opening up and the volume of sale of alcoholic beverages is increasing. But, as usual, here too there are excesses. Before the New Year in the food stores near my house, and even on the streets, the sale of wine was brisk. However, the officials pretend that nothing is going on. Judging by all this the people are ever more convinced that the distance between word and deed is still too great.

Could this result have been predicted? Without a doubt—knowing how people behave in certain situations. Psychologists, and I specifically, demanded that the

social-psychological factors be taken into consideration. But they did not listen to us. They preferred their customary strategy of global prohibitions.

Another example may be seen in the recent restrictive measures regarding cooperatives. It seems to me that not only the economic and legal, but also the psychological consequences of this step may be negative.

[Belitskiy] Probably, behind every acute social situation there is an unqualified resolution of socially significant problems?

[Lomov] Of course. Take the inter-ethnic conflicts in the Caucasus. Some people try to convince us that this is an unexpectedly emerging situation. These same people, apparently, at one time maintained that all the national problems in our country have been successfully resolved.

Based on this conception, 15 years ago the proposals of the Society of Psychologists to begin a comparative study on the questions of national psychology were refuted. So it happened that when the democratization of public life began, when the lacquer covering of real processes in society became, to put it mildly, unpopular, and much of what used to be stamped "secret" turned out to be subject to openness—we as a society were totally unprepared to digest all this information, so to speak. Particularly since we were not able to foresee the course of events and, of course, to prevent them. Now we must take measures as we go along, as they say.

This is why the Congress stressed the need for psychological expert investigation of all the major national-economic and social projects and technical and technological developments. No less important and, I would say, humanitarian, is the supervision of their implementation. We cannot do without this if we want important decisions which determine our lives for many years to come not only to be made, but, most importantly, also to be fulfilled.

It is understandable that in order to solve such a problem we must have both an appropriate program and a mechanism for its implementation. The Congress was able to accomplish much in this regard. First of all, I am referring to the specific measures proposed by the delegates on the development of general, social, political, economic, national-ethnic, legal and engineering psychology and its subsections in the sphere of labor, management, art, and so forth. We believe that it is necessary to create a series of scientific centers, a network of specialized consulting and psychological services within the national economy. We must sharply expand and enhance the training and re-training of specialists and finally create a viable material-technical base.

Of course, the basic problems of our lives are solved not by psychologists alone. Yet without them these problems could not be solved.

[Belitskiy] If you will allow me to ask a professional question. The means of mass information today are generally giving "eyeball" estimates of the reactions of readers and viewers to the published materials. Obviously the presence of feedback from the readers would be invaluable to each of us, and especially to each publication. However, this must be real, objective feedback. It is impossible to judge the degree of accuracy in "hitting the mark" by letters alone. How can we approach this problem in a scientific manner?

[Lomov] In science the most difficult thing is to answer specific questions of practical application. In general the work of each publication—with the aid of social psychologists—is to create its own system of feedback. However, your Union of Journalists could probably take the initiative in developing such systems, creating them together with the scientists.

For my part, I believe it necessary to ensure high objectivity of the materials in the means of mass information, the possibility of a truly pluralistic approach to the formulation of public opinion. This, of course, must be taken into consideration also in developing the law on the press.

[Belitskiy] This law, accordingly, must first be quite broadly discussed in order to avoid haste in decision making?

[Lomov] Well, if the press is not able to achieve a matter-of-fact discussion. But in general you have touched upon one of the radical questions of psychological restructuring: In each cause, in each profession, in each sector and in society as a whole we must primarily ensure the functioning of democratic mechanisms for a normal psychological climate. Without this we will not learn to work in the new manner. Psychology in the epoch of perestroika is a method of revolutionary transformations.

[Belitskiy] You can speak out so categorically on problems of psychology, Boris Fedorovich, both in your capacity as institute director and in your capacity as candidate deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I might add that you are the only candidate representing the country's psychologists seeking election to the USSR Academy of Sciences Union of Scientific Societies and Associations. What is your pre-election platform? What specifically would you like to introduce to the Supreme Soviet agenda?

[Lomov] The basic positions of my platform have been presented in our conversation above. I hope they will focus the attention of the voters on the decisive role of psychological factors in perestroika.

Issue of Bilingualism in Schools Brings Heated Response

18300313b Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 19 Jan 89 p 2

[Response by journalist V. Shtrits to letter sent by D. Bekbadov and A. Tortayev to KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA editors: "An 'Uncomfortable' Conclusion"]

[Text] Letter from the editors to D. Bekbadov and A. Tortayev.

Dear comrades! When we parted after looking into your complaint, it was difficult for me to immediately give you a synonymous answer to your appeal to the newspaper's editorial staff. Now, when the impressions have "settled", we may calmly speak of the problem you have touched upon. And this problem does indeed exist, although certain comrades both in Chimkent and in Lenger tried to convince me to the contrary...

Your statement consists of three main positions. The first: that School No 9 in Lenger previously bore the name of K. Satpayev, and they want to re-name it in honor of Hero of the Soviet Union N. Svinarchuk. In doing so, they are trying to insult the Kazakhs. The second position is that Lengera does not have enough Kazakh schools and Kazakh groups in its preschool institutions. And the third position is deduced from the first two... But then, let us wait with the conclusion. We will talk about it later.

It is true that during our chat you also expressed other dissatisfactions. However, some of them, in my opinion, bear a specific character, while others came to light only when emotions took the upper hand. Therefore, I assume that we will not deal in the pages of this newspaper with the trifles which came up in the course of the conversation.

Now about the facts as they appear in documents, as they are understood by the comrades with whom we spoke, and as I myself understand them.

When I told him about renaming School No 9, the reviewer of the oblispolkom deputy chairman Gabit Nyysanov immediately clarified:

"Giving one name or another to an organization, enterprise, etc. is within the jurisdiction of the republic's Council of Ministers. The oblast Soviet ispolkom makes the decision only about a petition. We do not have at our disposal the documents confirming the fact that School No 9 formerly bore the name of Satpayev. There are only petitions about giving it this name...

I saw these protocols of meetings first of the pedagogical, then of the students' collectives with the request to give the school the name of K. Satpayev, and the petition of the Lenger gorispolkom regarding the same matter.

"However, the order is such," Nyysanov pointed to his briefcase, "that a report by the school administration is also required. It must substantiate the request, i.e., it must explain why the name of this person, and not some other, should be given to the school—because he studied there or was born in this city. The administration of School No 9 never presented such a substantiation... No one has anything against Academician Satpayev. We all honor his memory. However, he has no relation either to School No 9, or to the city of Lenger..."

"We must also remember," continued the reviewer, "that there are already two schools in our oblast which bear the name of Academician Satpayev. Why should we create yet a third?"

"Yet Bekbadov assures us," I said, "that School No 9 already bore the name of Satpayev. Isn't it possible to verify this fact? And if it did not bear this name, to convince him and others that they are wrong?"

"We offered Bekbadov to come look for the document himself in the archives. We helped him to fill out the permission form, but he does not want to go there..."

And although I believe that it is nevertheless the responsibility of the oblispolkom comrades, since it is to them that the requests and petition were addressed, I would nevertheless like to know your opinion. You answered, comrade Bekbadov:

"First of all, there is no time, and secondly, I myself worked in the school when it bore this name. I can show anyone the place on the wall where Satpayev's portrait used to hang. The nail which it hung on is still there. Do I really need archive confirmation?"

I cannot conceal the impression that in essence no one bothered to find out whether or not the school at one time bore the name of K. Satpayev, and why the decision was made to give it another name. Neither the workers of the Chimkent obkom nor the Lenger party raykom introduced any clarity into this question.

The fog cleared when the director of the school, A. Musyrmanov, related the following story. In the 60's, the building which today belongs to School No 9 housed a boarding school for shepherd children. The instruction here was conducted in Kazakh, and the school bore the name of K. Satpayev. The number of shepherd children studying here became fewer and fewer as the years passed, and the time came when the boarding school had to be closed down. By that time the building which then housed the Russian School No 9 had become totally unusable, and the school was moved to the building of the former boarding school. This rayon of Lenger is populated primarily by native residents, and the school became a Kazakh-Russian school. Today there are 357 children studying in the classes where instruction is conducted in Kazakh, and 230 children in the Russian language classes.

After some time had elapsed, the collective of School No 9 (initially Russian) began to ask that the school be named in honor of the Hero of the Soviet Union N. Svinarchuk, who lived in Lenger and worked here in a mine. Yet the teachers of the Kazakh "half" insisted by right of ownership ("the building, after all, is ours") that it be named in honor of K. Satpayev. By that time, those who recalled that the former boarding school had once borne this name had either retired or transferred to work elsewhere. Only Bekbadov, said the director, still worked here as headmaster.

"Svinarchuk has fully earned the right to have his name perpetuated," you said. But let them give it to some other school, or to some enterprise or farm. This school has already been given the name of Academician Satpayev..."

"However, it was not this school, Duysen, not School No 9, but the boarding school," I clarified, "the one that no longer exists, with only the building remaining."

A few days after my return to Alma-Ata, G. Nyysanov called me and said that they had found the documents in the archives. On 17 November 1964 the oblispolkom had adopted the decision to give the boarding school the name of K. Satpayev.

"That means Bekbadov was right?"

"We don't know yet. I have already said that the ispolkom makes decisions only about petitions, while the Council of Ministers grants [the names]. Also, we have not yet determined whether or not there was a government resolution..."

Do you know why I am writing in such detail about all this? It is so that you too, the reader, can see how an elementary question becomes an almost insoluble problem, when from the very beginning none of the officials want to thoroughly check into the state of affairs, considering them to be unnecessary trifles.

You said: the story of granting the name to the school wounds the pride of the Kazakhs. You are drawing far-reaching conclusions from it...

In my opinion, if we are to draw a conclusion here, it is only the following one: Nothing inflicts such harm upon inter-ethnic relations as red tape and a clerical-bureaucratic attitude toward work. In reality, was it really so difficult to determine whether the boarding school bore the name of K. Satpayev? Was it so difficult to thoroughly explain to the people the existing order? And not in one's office, having summoned their representatives, but by going to the collective...

If your question had been resolved efficiently and intelligently in the oblispolkom, then, most probably, the thought of supposedly wounded national pride would never have arisen. Is that not so?

There are 22,000 people living in Lenger, including 5,000 Kazakhs and 11,800 Russians. The others are Uzbeks, Tatars, Azerbaijanis, Ukrainians, and Germans—a total of 45 nationalities in all. There are 8 schools in the city. Of these, one—School No 2 imeni Ch. Valikhanov—is Kazakh, and another, No 9, about which we are speaking, is Kazakh-Russian. There are 936 children studying at the School imeni Ch. Valikhanov, while in No 9 there are 357 students in the classes where instruction is conducted in Kazakh.

Is this number of school spaces enough for the children of Kazakh nationality or not? The party raykom says it is. Nevertheless, there was no assurance in the voices of the comrades. Perhaps there are parents who would like their children to attend a Kazakh school, but there are not enough openings for them? Who asked them about this? And if there are such families, how many of them are there? Who knows? Who conducted a survey?

Yet you, Comrades Bekbadov and Tortayev, categorically announced: "There is not enough". The figures, you said, supposedly speak in your favor. Yet you are basing them only on the nationality, and not on the desire of the school children to learn and of their parents to have their children taught in one language or another.

You are proposing that School No 9 be made "purely Kazakh". After all, the residents living in the rayon where it is located are primarily of the native population. Many children go three stops farther by bus to School No 2, since No 9 cannot accommodate them all. Moreover, there are two villages adjoining the rayon, whose residents also want their children to study at School No 9. The quality of instruction is higher in the city. However, the rayispolkom does not take this into consideration. The rural residents, they say, have their own school. There is no reason to increase the difficulties for the city.

The problem would be solved, you said during our conversation, if the Russian portion of the school—230 children—were transferred to another building. But where? A. Musyrmanov was categorical (we can understand why: he himself is the director of this school). He said that although he has been working here only a short time, he already understands that the school must necessarily be divided. He also made it clear that the impossibility of taking on additional students of Kazakh nationality and the argument over the name of the school have created a not too favorable situation within the pedagogical collective...

You are proposing transferring the Russian section to the boarding school located nearby on the river, which, in your opinion, is quite spacious—48 rooms. They object: on the contrary, there is even a shortage of spaces in the boarding school, as confirmed by a study conducted by an authoritative commission. As you understand, the children studying there need special conditions. To ignore them and to lay claim to their space is tactless in the very least.

You are probably right in that the rayon and city authorities have not as yet overtaxed themselves in solving this problem. The variant with the boarding school did not work out, but what is being proposed in its place? Nothing. It is as if the problem did not exist.

But what I decisively cannot accept is how you present this fact: The Russian part of School No 9 is not being moved because the leaders of the rayon and the city do not want Kazakh children to study in Kazakh schools. This is not common sense speaking, but insult, although it is difficult to understand, at whom.

And it is for naught that you draw the same conclusion when you speak of the shortage of Kazakh groups in preschool institutions. There is only one such group in the city, and that is at the departmental kindergarten "Podsněžnik", which the Chimgent Production Association "Fosfor" built here for its workers.

I visited this group and spoke with the headmistress M. Yesenkobylova, a recent graduate of the pedagogical school. Her work here is difficult. She has no experience, no one to consult with, and there is a shortage of visual aids. Yet she is a great enthusiast and believes that she is performing a useful task. There are 26 children in her group. It was important for me to learn how the group was formed.

"Exclusively by petitions of the parents," I heard.

"Perhaps there were more applicants than positions?"

"On the contrary. At first there were 30 children in the group. Evidently this number will decrease even more. Some parents are talking about sending their children to other groups..."

Both in the party raykom and in the gorkom they said that no one opposes starting Kazakh groups in kindergartens, but for whom? There are no applications.

Your conclusion is: But who knows that there are no takers? Who asked the parents? Not those who work at "Fosfor", but all the rest...

So you see it is not so simple. And, once again, the question is not being studied by anyone in depth.

This is the time to speak about the general conclusion of your announcement. You believe that the situation which has arisen with the Kazakh schools and with Kazakh groups in kindergartens has arisen because the rayon management is made up primarily of Russians.

Well, let us examine this too. Of course, not everything can be solved by simple arithmetic breakdown by nationalities. Yet you have posed the question directly, and the answer to it must also be direct. The rayispolkom and gorispolkom chairmen are Kazakhs. The raykom second party secretary is a Kazakh. Out of 6 section heads, 5 are

Kazakhs, and so forth—down to the instructors. Perhaps today, after the rayon party conference which was held, this "breakdown" is somewhat different, but that is how it was when I came to visit the rayon and when you were drawing your erroneous conclusion...

In resolving some question, we do not always and everywhere relate it to problems of national relations. We sometimes do not even stop to think how certain actions or, on the contrary, someone's inaction, will affect the culture of these relations.

When we begin to study and consider the national peculiarities of each region prior to making any administrative decisions, then global conclusions, and particularly those with a national subtext, will not be drawn from specific questions.

Ministry of Health Continues AIDS Investigation
18300313c Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
4 Feb 89 p 1

[Article by S. Tutorskaya: "Is Medical Reporting Playing the Hypocrite?" A Study of the Reasons for Infection of Children with the AIDS Virus.]

[Text] An alarming piece of news which the newspapers have already reported has aroused the readers. Antibodies to the AIDS virus have been found in the blood of 27 small children at the republic children's hospital in Elist. Five of the mothers have also been infected. We know that the investigation has not yet been concluded, and new circumstances of this occurrence are still coming to light. Here is what M. NARKEVICH, chief of the USSR Ministry of Health Epidemiological Main Administration, reported.

"The situation," Mikhail Ivanovich told us, "is unprecedented. If we accept the presented version of transmission of the virus through infection with a non-sterile needle, then infection with such intensity is simply unrealistic. We have contacted the Center for AIDS Research in Switzerland and Sweden and the director of the WHO [World Health Organization] Global Program on AIDS, D. Makhn. All of them have confirmed that this is the first time that they too have come upon such a situation, and that our doubts are warranted."

"Now," said M. Narkevich, "Soviet specialists are flying to Sweden. They are taking with them samples of blood from the infected children for repeated study and clarification of the obtained data. In Elist itself, a 9-man commission of the RSFSR Ministry of Health is working. As yet we cannot thoroughly answer the question of what happened and where the primary source of the infection was, although there are new facts and real proposals. We believe that in a few days everything will become clear, and we promise not to conceal anything."

Well, we will hope that soon everything will indeed become clear. But for now we would like to return to those signals of specialists which we received a year and two years ago. The medical men said that the statistics on persons carrying the AIDS virus and on AIDS patients in our country are most probably understated and incomplete. USSR Deputy Minister of Health A. Kondrusev also spoke about the fact that, due to the existing lack of caution by doctors and their inattention to clear clinical indicators of the illness, such a thing is quite possible (as yet, special tests are performed still in small volumes and selectively). After all, shortly before this it became apparent that Olga G., who had died in Leningrad, had AIDS. Doesn't all this mean that the situation is more serious than the official statistics represent it?

Prior to final conclusions, it is difficult for the commission to synonymously judge the situation. Here haste does not further the cause of the matter. Neither do hasty announcements that the children infected with the virus will not be accepted by any (!) children's institution. There is no such state or departmental statute which would affirm such order. This would be monstrous, especially if we consider the fact that everyday contacts are not dangerous and children who have been found to have the antibodies to the virus cannot, in the opinion of our own and foreign specialists, infect other children.

And so, let us arm ourselves with patience. IZVESTIYA will return to this topic in a few days.

Language Problem Remains Unresolved

18300314 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 22 Jan 89 p 3

[Article by Gerold Belger: "How to Overcome Language Problems. Toward the CPSU Central Committee Plenum: Improving Interethnic Relations"]

[Text] The fate of ethnic languages worries everyone these days. Not so long ago it seemed that the consigning of native speech to oblivion, the lowering of it to a household, primitive colloquial level were characteristic only of the descendants of formerly repressed peoples, ethnic minorities scattered throughout cities and villages, or of those who have no state-territorial formations of their own. At least this would have been explainable. Yet, it turns out that entire nations, with their own state-territorial unity and sovereignty, reinforced in various legal documents, are sounding the alarm.

Somewhat unexpectedly for everyone or, more precisely, for the overwhelming majority, it was discovered that the situation with the native speech of Ukrainians, Belorussians, Tadjiks, Kazakhs, the Kirghiz, and many others is bad. Everyone rushed to "find the culprits." Some overly wild sorts see the whole threat in "the domination of the Russian language." Openly or other-

wise, such silliness is sometimes expressed today. Understandably, however, the Russian language is not the point here. It is our essence. Without it, we are all an empty, decrepit shell. It is another matter, that the great Russian language itself, paradoxical though it may seem, before our very eyes is becoming noticeably coarser, more impoverished, as though dissolving or being diluted, through our common efforts becoming primitive, more ancient, becoming an increasingly flatter communication media, "a departmentally standard language," in the words of K. Chukovskiy, losing its fabled might and basic essence, deprived of its ages-old richness and beauty. I think that Russians are also justified in taking offense for their own native language.

So, what is the problem? Why has this happened? Where did all these linguistic burdens that have fallen on us come from? It is good that this can be openly explained now, both historically, politically and psychologically. True, we speak unwillingly of our "own," our "local and ethnic" near-sightedness. We prefer to curse someone else's grandfather. Yet, we are rousing ourselves, sometimes to hysteria. We almost fail to take historic, social, national and muddle-headed motives into account. These have existed and still exist. The prose and script writer Smagul Yelubayev recently discussed the Kazakh language sensibly and soberly in KAZAKH ADEBIYETI. He is right: don't be proud, like Khodzha Nasreddin, about cutting off the branch on which you sit. It makes sense to look a little further than one's own nose. Indeed, we should not always look askance at others: sometimes it is useful to take a look at ourselves.

The bitter truth is that there is no use crying over spilt milk. A great deal has been spilt over the decades. However, it is hard to reconcile oneself to the fact that this is all irretrievably and hopelessly lost. Indeed, one should not reconcile oneself! Although, we also know from experience that reviving, re-creating and restoring is always difficult, tormenting and painful. However, what can be done? Above all, the idea of preserving one's ethnic language, history, and culture must penetrate deeply into each person's awareness and be possessed by the masses.

How can this be achieved? One thing is obvious: there is little use in the hysterical moans and groans, sighs, and reciprocal appeals by famous poets. No matter how much you say "halvah, halvah!," candy will not appear in your mouth. The many pretty phrases remain meaningless. Of course, one can declare, to all who will hear, one's readiness to die today, if one's native language disappears tomorrow, but (alas!) this is only rhetoric. One ethnic writer, discussing the quintessence and extract of the soul as expressed in native speech, fights for it ardently, yet he himself does not write in his native language. True, I personally see no sin in this, since it is possible, I suppose, to write in any language when there is something to say. Another one shouts about ethnic schools from all rostrums, yet he himself does not interact with his own children in his native tongue and,

moreover, does not educate them at their own ethnic school. A third moans: "Oybay, Oybay! (or: God, oh God!). Who will read my poems tomorrow?!"

It should be said that so much hypocrisy and common demagoguery has been wrapped and twisted about this truly painful problem recently, that one simply does not want to and cannot believe any of the grippers, the boisterous native language "zealots." We do not need moans and groans or effective phrases, but specific, systematic and purposeful work.

Already, some people see the only solution in universally declaring and constitutionally reinforcing the native language of one republic or another as nothing more or less than a state language. "State language" can elicit an irrepressible ecstasy from some of us: we leap up from our seats, applaud and "toss our hats in the air." Clearly, there is nothing wrong or seditious about such an outburst. But, what if we think calmly and sensibly? Unquestionably, the state language question can be substantiated historically, politically, economically, legally, philosophically, and lord knows how else. Quotes and opinions can be found in abundance.

What if we nonetheless proceed from specifics? Starting with reality? What if we take, for instance, the situation in Kazakhstan? It seems, we get into such theoretical and practical debris in our discussions, that we are utterly confusing ourselves and ruining vital work.

In our republic's contemporary language situation, I interpret the talk about a state language as a sort of act of despair. I do not share the opinion, for instance, that things will change for the better if, for example, the Kazakh language is constitutionally declared a state language? (I note parenthetically that I *personally* in no way oppose this, since I was raised in a Kazakh language environment, know and love the Kazakh language, admire it and fight for it everywhere). I strongly doubt that such a legislative act will be a panacea for all ills. What specifically would change? Would the language's prestige increase? After all, a language's prestige is not achieved by law, but by its speakers. Would it be used in all social spheres? Would a strong incentive for growth in ethnic self-awareness arise? Would it flourish according to a law, according to instructions?...

In general, there is something speculative and far from reality in the discussions of state language. Sh. Urazayev, UzSSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, writes: "However, let us consider the question in a few other aspects. There are over 100 peoples and nationalities, and 53 republics and autonomous formations in the USSR and, consequently, given equal rights among languages, should there be just as many state languages? Is this logical? Sometimes the most humane and dearly held common human values are lost from sight in the dust of polemics, while immediate problems are exaggerated." (PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 23 Dec 88).

I am personally sympathetic to this formulation of the question. I am inclined to think that, in the realm of culture and language, no instruction or law whatsoever will have an effect. We must create conditions for the flourishing of culture. The rest, that which is good and worthy of man, grows out of genuine culture.

Obviously, ethnic language problems should not be considered locally or autonomously, but as a comprehensive set of social relations. We must patiently and purposefully educate and cultivate ethnic self-awareness. As it turns out, on the one hand, we are organizing discussion of the state language and, on the other, some leaders of oblast rank sincerely question why business must be conducted in the native language in Kazakh rayons, and what simultaneous translation, typewriters with a Kazakh keyboard, language study clubs, etc., are needed for.

I do not say this without evidence: there was such a case quite recently, at a high committee meeting.

We should start by instilling a feeling of ethnic awareness. We must inspire the representative of one ethnic group or another: if he is no longer interested in his own history, his own culture, and his own language because of his heart's summons and his spirit's demand, because of the duty of honor and conscience, he will do nothing by force, because of an order. It is time to realize that the world has become extraordinarily complex and more difficult—if you want to survive, to preserve your ethnic group, spirit, language, and culture in this strict competition, don't close yourself up, but assert yourself, break free of the morass of primitivism and narrow-mindedness and see to the matter above all YOURSELF, and do not place hope on the fact that things will occur quickly.

It seems to me that dramatics in the matter of languages is useless, unproductive and superfluous. We are tired of persuading each other of the use of preserving and knowing the native language. After all, this is a truism. How many agitated, brilliant speeches have been made about this in recent years in the republic's Union of Writers alone! Every time, listening to the outpourings of the usual speaker on the sacredness of the native language, I involuntarily think to myself: "All true, my friend! However, what are you yourself doing in the name of preserving the native language? How will it help to compile high-quality, interesting textbooks and readers in the native language, which are thoroughly useless? Are you interested in the condition of the teaching of the native language and literature in the schools? Do you meet with the students and teachers often? What kind of specific help have you given to compile dictionaries and phrase-books? Have you given brilliant, instructive native-language lessons on television and radio? Did you light a spark in the hearts of your fellow countrymen, who do not know the native language and display complete indifference to it?..." There are so many of these questions.

The point is also not to intimidate: they say that if your native language perishes, you perish too. However, people are interacting, working, living and even writing books in the "other" language. One should not be frightened, spark fears, or go into hysterics, but calmly and strictly note: having lost your native language, of course, you will not perish, you simply become qualitatively different. You were a people, then became a population. Then—a resident. Then—a [mankurtom]. Such is the future. This is what you think and choose.

Recently, we discovered local Kazakhs in France. The most tragic fates! I remember the story of one of them: his father was born in Pakistan, he himself was born in Turkey, and his son was born in Paris. Yet, after all, they do speak Kazakh, albeit with a Turkish accent. They sing Kazakh songs, preserve the customs, and play the *dombra*. This is an example worthy of imitation, both for Kazakhs, as well as for Soviet Germans, Koreans, and all other races and nationalities.

I am sure that salvation lies in bilingualism. Let me say this more cautiously: a certain, to some extent, salvation. Sometimes, they say, bilingualism is something specially applied. I do not think so, although there is a great deal of this. In my view, bilingualism is a sociopolitical, social, philosophical and democratic foundation, upon which something can be built. For the present, given the existing language situation, I personally see nothing else and nothing better. We need only use, cultivate, and apply this theoretical principle, already proven in practice.

There is no sense in verbose theorizing as to what ethnic-Russian bilingualism is. Personally, much has been said about it already. However, in my opinion, while fighting for bilingualism we sometimes resort to incorrect allegations. Firstly, bilingualism in no way means that people ought to have two native languages. There is probably one native language, nonetheless. Secondly, the allegation that a thorough mastery of another language can only exist at the expense of the native language is faulty and harmful. Thirdly, knowledge of another language is in no way the only criterion for internationalism.

Of course, we must encourage the aspirations of citizens of other nationalities to study the language of their own native nationalities. This is a mark of culture and respect. However, after learning 100 or so words, after memorizing a dozen or so phrases by rote, a citizen of another nationality, obviously, will not be any more international than he was before. The culture of relations itself toward the native race, toward its history, customs and mores, traditions, and toward everything that makes up its ethnic essence, is probably more important.

Bilingualism offers tremendous possibilities for overcoming language problems in our society. Here, I will resort to a phrase from Chingiz Aytmatov, who expressed the essence of this idea very precisely: "We

seek a way, not to push ethnic language onto history's roadside, but to join two languages as equals within the bounds of an ethnic region, to cultivate equal respect toward them."

"To join two languages as equals..." is absolutely correct. Things, so to speak, depend on the details: putting this idea into practice.

Here, we must be sober realists. We must clearly realize, within what limits and in what direction one ethnic language or another can potentially be developed under our conditions. Alas, such limits exist and certain levels of limitation will remain. They are not dictated by someone's subjective ill will, but by entirely specific, real, objective circumstances. There is no point in amusing ourselves with self-deception or euphemistic figures. Recently, this was stated clearly by Mukhammadzhan Shukurov, Tadjik SSR Academy of Sciences member: "Thus, an ethnic language can have the necessary level of development only when it functions fully in the basic areas of society's life—in education at all levels, in science, culture and art, in a significant part of record keeping, in official circles and, naturally, in everyday interaction."

Some would argue that it is proper and permissible to speak of an ethnic language's true development only under such ideal conditions. I myself cannot even imagine our multi-national society providing such conditions for all the languages, without exception, of all the peoples and nationalities who are settling this enormous land. This is unfeasible, even with the best intentions, since good will and wishes are simply inadequate for this. However, a certain level is possible and should nonetheless be preserved through the equal combination of two languages.

How can this be achieved? This, it seems, is obvious to everyone: above all, record keeping within practical and reasonable limits; the cultivation of the ethnic language everywhere; practical use of the language at all levels of human interaction; ethnic schools and kindergartens at a high level, not as a primitive experiment which leads to self-isolation; intelligible textbooks, phrase-books and dictionaries; constant attention to the culture of public speech, and not that depressing confused articulation, which often rains down on us from various channels; elementary literacy in various visual propaganda materials, etc., etc.

This is all realistic and feasible, if we do not gripe, but do the work. Above all, the people themselves, the speakers of the ethnic language, not a handful of enthusiasts and do-gooders, must believe in this. The realm of application and use of the native language also determines its tenacity and endurance. So, one thing remains to be done: we must patiently, methodically and persistently use and implement the real opportunities that the current constructive period of restructuring grants and provides us.

Tatar Academic Criticizes Uniform Language Policy for Republics

18300286a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 31 Jan 89 p 2

[Article by K. Gizatov, doctor of philosophical sciences and professor of the Kazan Culture Institute: "Sifting the Wheat From the Chaff"]

[Text] The national relations in our country are in need of the most critical analysis and frank and truthful exposure of their internal mechanism. Let us recall V. I. Lenin. In "Critical Notes on the National Question," he pointed out two historical tendencies in the national question under capitalism. "The first: the awakening of a national life and national movements, the struggle against any kind of national oppression and the establishment of national states. The second: the development and increase in frequency of all kinds of relations between nations, the breaking down of national partitions and the establishment of international unity of capital, economic life in general, politics, science and so on."

Of course, even under socialism, despite the different foundation and superstructure, these tendencies, which are opposite one another in their own directions, are maintained. The national differences are based on them.

The national feelings have been wounded. They can be offended even without any kind of deliberate intent—as V. I. Lenin noted: by carelessness, in the form of a joke. Legitimate irritations in people are caused even by verbal stereotypes which have become current, however, which distort the historical truth. I will dwell on one of them in more detail. Recently, a journalist, during a discussion with Rasul Gamzatov, expressed the opinion that the 300-year-old Tatar-Mongol yoke is echoed in the Russians' everyday consciousness only by one proverb and it is used most frequently in a joking sense.

Let us recall the history: "Tatars" was the name of one of the bellicose tribes which made up the forces of Genghis Khan. Later, this word came to designate the representatives of all the Turkic tribes and peoples who settled the territory to the south and east of the Russian Slavs. Today, "Tatars" is the name given to the basic nationality of the Tatar Autonomous Republic. Representatives of it reside in the Kazakh and Uzbek republics and in the Chelyabinsk, Sverdlovsk, Perm, Orenburg, Ulyanovsk and Tyumen oblasts and in the autonomous republics of the Volga River Region. In talking about the Tatar-Mongol invasion and the Tatar-Mongol yoke, scarcely anyone thinks about the etymology of the word "Tatars," which derives its origin from the eastern conquerors of the 13th century. But, still, this word is certainly connected with the ancestors of the modern-day Tatars...

Let me remind you of a historical truth that is well-known in the broad circles of specialists. The ancestors of the modern-day Tatars were the Volga Bulgars, who not only had nothing to do with the Mongol invasion, but themselves became its victim. Volga Bulgaria was first to feel the blow of the Mongol conquerors. In 1223, it successfully repulsed the Mongol forces' attack, but, in 1236, it was forced to yield to the latter and was finally subjugated in 1241. The Volga Bulgars, as well as their descendants, had absolutely nothing to do with the strengthening of the horde's yoke.

Certain authors are also incorrect in their interpretation of the events associated with the Battle of Kulikovo in 1380. It has become customary to regard the Tatar as their main participant. But, in fact, the "Tatar make-up" of Mamai's horde is denied by many historians of the past!

The illogicality of this entire situation disturbs some representatives of the Tatar intelligentsia even today. This is explained precisely by the discussion recently by the local press of the question of the origin of modern-day Tatars and the suggestion about renaming the "Tatar" to the "Bulgar" and the republic itself to Volga Bulgaria.

Of course, there is absolutely no need for such a "cosmetic repair" of the nation. Moreover, this would smear the honor and dignity of the Tatar people, who have earned the right to respect from the other peoples of USSR with the sweat and blood poured out in persistent labor, as well as in the military—both in the years of peaceful development and in time of war.

The desire of each people to discover as thoroughly as possible their own inherent potentialities and to increase even more their progress is a natural one. Even here, there should not be any cliches or repressive regulations of any kind. But there are! Take, for example, one such matter. Tataria, as is well known, is an autonomous republic. There arises a great number of economic and social problems in connection with this. The status of "autonomy" has, by no means, been worked out thoroughly and certain aspects of life in such republics simply cause bewilderment.

First, science. Whereas each union republic has its own Academy of Sciences, with a widespread network of scientific research institutes, Tataria, in accordance with its autonomous status, has only a branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences, with its relatively limited capabilities. Second. Each union republic has several publishing houses, including a specialized one for issuing scientific output. Tataria, as it is, has its own book publishing house (incidentally, one of the largest in the RSFSR), however, it does not have the right to publish scientific output, particularly social and political series. Third. In all the union republics, there are studios for artistic films. In the autonomous republics, there are none. And

yet, this same Tataria has a large detachment of the artistic intelligentsia. This matter, even if timidly, is already being raised in the press, but time is passing...

According to the results of the 1979 census, the number of citizens of Tatar nationality amounts to 6,317,000 persons and, numerically, this is the sixth largest group in the country. More complete realization of their creative potentialities would benefit all the country's peoples.

But, of course, it is necessary to consider another thing as well. Amplification of the role of one nation or people or another in the life of the country can lead to national self-importance and vanity, conceit and landowner-like permissiveness. This is particularly typical for representatives of those peoples who themselves experienced national discrimination relatively recently.

Recently, heated arguments have been caused by the question of the national languages. This, of course, is no accident. In many republics, especially in urban areas, the national schools are being cut out, the number of people who read in their native language is shrinking and the role and importance of the latter as a means of daily intercourse for the people are diminishing more and more. Rasul Gamzatov says that the native language produces for him the image of the cradle. But, there are certain people, including some of the Tatar nationality, who are shy, so it seems, about conversing in their native language.

The Russian language, having become widespread and having penetrated into the people's everyday life, in truth, has become the second native language of all the USSR's peoples. No one even denies this. The Russian language, in addition to the fact that it is a means of intercourse for people of different nationalities, introduces them to a world of new intellectual values and gives them access to the treasure houses of the culture common to all humanity. And still... If everything follows such a course, will not the people forget their own native sources, and will not the younger generation, being out of touch with these valuable things, lose contact with its own historical past? People are asking that a way out of the existing situation be found. They are raising the question of increasing the number of national schools and affirming the national languages as state languages.

It is possible to understand the concern of those who want to preserve their own national language and their own culture. However, it would hardly be correct to pursue this goal by administrative and command measures. V. I. Lenin wrote that "...the great and powerful Russian language does not require that anyone should have to study it under the lash" and that those "who, by the conditions of their own life and work, require knowledge of the Russian language, will learn it, even without

the lash." Lenin considered it necessary that there be "...a lack of a compulsory state language, while providing the people with schools with instruction in all the local languages..."

Today, in the Baltic republics, the languages of the native nationalities are acquiring the status of state languages. It would be incorrect to figure that this is true in all our republics. Experience has shown that the administrative method is a poor assistant in the national question.

In Tataria, at the end of the "50's," the experience was bitter indeed. In the name of the preservation of the national schools, the Tatars, inhabitants of a rural area, were ordered to send their own children only to the national schools. One result of this was that a portion of the rural area children, in light of the remoteness of the Tatar villages from one another, stayed out of school completely. The ruinous nature of the separation of children on the basis of nationality in the kindergartens was confirmed by specific examples. It is impracticable to raise the question also of mechanically increasing the number of national schools. It is not necessary to mix up different things: the number of national schools in some republics has been cut back not as a result of orders from above, but rather, as a consequence of the reduction in the number of children sent by their parents to the national schools. Here, the conditions for admittance into the VUZ's, according to which the Russian language was specified as one of the compulsory subjects, played their own negative role. In conformity with the new admittance rules, the applicant selects the language exam himself...

The international friendship and solidarity of the USSR's nations and peoples have been formed and strengthened in their joint struggle and labor. This friendship and unity are the guarantee of further successes and victories on the path of the building of the communist society in our country.

1988 Birth Rate Drops, UkSSR Not Satisfying Child Nourishment Needs

*18000521 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
21 Dec 88 p 2*

[Article by V. Danilov: "What is on the Children's Menu?"]

[Text] Bad news -the birthrate is falling. The USSR State Committee on Statistics informs that during eight months of this year 105 thousand fewer babies were born than during the same months of last year. And our republic was not even as "productive" last year -whereas 792.6 thousand babies were born in 1986, only 760.9 thousand were born in 1987.

There are several reasons for the fall in the birthrate. These include the low standard of living in several areas of our republic, as well as the increasing cost of living both in the marketplace and State trade... Whether we like it or not, this all has an effect on family planning.

The appearance of a baby in the world creates a tremendous number of problems. Where should we put the baby carriage? What will the baby wear? What shall we feed it?... Yes indeed, this is one of the problems which causes young parents great anxiety. And it is understandable: the baby food industry is not satisfying the population's child nourishment needs. As became clear from a report by the Ukrainian SSR State Committee on Statistics, the republic's State Agricultural Industry currently produces a total of only 1.6 kilograms of sterilized vitamin-enriched milk, 40 grams of yogurt, 10 grams of milk kissel and 5.9 conventional jars of vegetable juice (one jar weighs 400 grams) per child under the age of two.

In September, after reviewing the question of further developing the production of children's food products, the Politburo of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee noted that the Ukrainian SSR State Agricultural Industry, the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Health, the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Trade, the Ukrainian Cooperative Union and the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of the Building Materials Industry, who have been called upon to resolve this important task, are slow to reorganize their work and are not ensuring a radical improvement in the organization of child nourishment. Yes, this is unfortunately the way it is. This year, Vitalakt's production of infant food products fell by almost half, the production of children's canned vegetables, tomatoes and fruit was reduced and the manufacture of milk kissel decreased.

There is concern that the number of orders filled for dairy and meat products, infant formula, Malyutka and Malysh dried products, porridge and portioned sausage is so low that it is not worth mentioning (it was only 6 percent for Vitalakt milk kissel). And how is it possible to evaluate the position of the enterprises of the Ukrainian SSR State Agricultural Industry when they do not take any orders from the trade organizations for curdled cream, cottage cheese pancakes, small dietary sausages, Malysh sausages, high-grade children's sausage and canned meat?

Of course, the employees of the Ukrainian SSR State Agricultural Industry who are responsible for child nourishment may object: they say the fixed quota for the majority of children's food products is being fulfilled, and the production of dietary starch products, sterilized vitamin-enriched milk and infant yogurt has increased compared with last year... This is all true. But this "increase" will not fill a child's stomach. And the empty shelves in the stores are a silent reproach to the employees of the republic's State Agricultural Industry.

Student Describes Influence of Jewish 'Underground' Group in Kishinev

18000555a Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 31 Jan 89 p 3

[Article by I. Litvak, student at the Kishinev State University: "A Gescheft With a Long-Range Goal, or Something About the 'Friend' of the Jewish People"]

[Text] In April 1987, I read in SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA the article by I. Tronin entitled "The Uncrowned Kings of Refusal." I was not only surprised but amazed that such a thing was really possible. The impression was gained that in Kishinev an almost underground organization was operating. I developed an interest in this secret company of "kings" and wanted myself to understand this. But the noble intention soon passed, life resumed its own pace and I ceased thinking about these people.

This would have been the end of things if once I had not come across a curious announcement in the advertisement section. This stated that persons having literature written in Modern Hebrew could phone the given number in the aim of exchanging books or selling them. I decided to call...

The conversation was short and 2 hours later I met Zinovi Gilichenskiy, a pleasant-looking fellow of 22 years. As it subsequently turned out, Zinovi had also been "raked over the coals" in "Uncrowned Kings."

Our acquaintance is now about a year old. A good deal of time in principle to draw certain conclusions and analyze what it has given me. I was not wrong in expecting to meet an intelligent person. Zinovi, undoubtedly, is well read and has a good understanding of certain areas of knowledge. And in terms of appearance, and this is also important, he leaves the best impression. In a word, an excellent visiting card as in a good store: they meet you politely, they serve you excellently and offer something for consumption on the premises.

I think that many will recall the middle of the 1970s, when the emigration of Jews from the USSR assumed a rather large scope. The attitude toward this phenomenon had certain absurd, ersatz forms. There was no recognition of any grey area and if you left you were the enemy and if you remained you were one of ours. Seemingly a sort of political and social Daltonism had arisen. At that time there also existed small groups which helped people to leave, taught them the language and acquainted them with the customs of the future place of residence. This was the case and it must not be dismissed out of hand just as we must not overlook the fact that now the departure of those wishing to leave our land has been facilitated to a maximum. Convenient? And how! But it turns out that it is not advantageous for all.

The problem is that those same "groups" remained and new ones have sprouted from them and they continue to be concerned with the same thing, helping those wishing

to leave. As of now, around 14 percent of all the Jewish population living in the USSR has left our country. It turns out that in the opinion of the "groups," this is not enough. Hence it is essential to inspire reasons for leaving, seek them out and force persons to see them.

For such motivation I have only one request: not to be involved in the percentage mania of the "groups." Don't they consider a push for a 100-percent result essential?

Incidentally, no, 100 percent will not be obtained and this is not even to the benefit of the representatives of the "groups." How otherwise would there be any example to show the "hellish conditions of life for the Jews in the USSR" and the "degradation of the Jewish nation far from the 'homeland'." And as a counterbalance to the "gloomy" picture, to show the clearly opposite situation in some foreign state, for example, in Israel.

But am I not contradicting myself? And how is Zinovi Gilichenskiy involved here? He knows Modern Hebrew and when the occasion arises, offers to teach it. And that is all. And in all of this I, to put it frankly, am grateful to Zinovi. Certainly due to him I have been able, albeit not completely, to become acquainted with the questions of the historical and cultural development of the Jewish people. But certain views of Zinovi seemed strange to me and unacceptable.

At our very first meeting, Zinovi explained that he and his friends met on Tuesdays and Sundays to provide help to those wishing to study Modern Hebrew and that in the course of the exercises it was possible also to listen to lectures on the questions of the Jewish religion, history and culture. I was given my first lesson in Modern Hebrew right there, on a bench in the park of culture. Then Zinovi took me to task for my lack of headgear, having said that a real Jew always goes about with a covered head.

Thus, there entered into my conscience the notion of a "real" Jew. Inherent to a "real one" is a series of features: he should speak Modern Hebrew, live according to the laws of the Jewish religion, worship the Torah and wear headgear.

Yes, but a real Jew should also be concerned for the development of the culture and art of his people. Zinovi did not deny this, however to my offer of going to see a performance of the Vilnius Jewish Theater which was on tour in Kishinev, he replied with the refusal: "There is no time." No time to become acquainted with the modern culture of his people?

Gilichenskiy distributed the components of the concept of a "real Jew" over several meetings. But one facet was emphasized at each meeting: one can only become a real Jew in Israel. Honestly speaking, at these moments I felt myself to be some "incubator" incapable of claiming all the goods and opportunities of a "real" one.

Zinovi had a good understanding of the fundamentals of Judaism, he had a good knowledge of its history, he possessed an entire arsenal of stories and legends and related them with emotion and understanding. At home he always met me wearing a yarmulke, in always having with him a tallith. Several times he proposed that we go off to the synagogue. And on Passover I actually went there. And I was struck by the beauty of the relations reigning in the synagogue. The people, all festively dressed, had actually come for the holiday.

I gained a further understanding of the religion of the Jewish people in Zinovi's apartment. Never in my life had I seen such an amount of religious literature as there was here. Although, as it turned out, Zinovi and I had different tastes: I preferred literature on history and culture while he constantly stuffed me with religious. In truth, there is no bad without good and the reading of such books helped me better understand the actions and views of Gilichenskiy.

Everything started the moment I learned that he did not know Yiddish. This is the language of the Eastern European Jews, including those in our nation. Zinovi's ignorance of Yiddish stunned me. He explained that he did not study Yiddish out of principle. What one sees from the example of the works of Sholom Alekhem is how this language has exhausted itself. Hence, according to Zinovi's logic, it follows that no one reads the works in Yiddish.

Generally speaking, he feels, one cannot consider seriously what is written in the Soviet Union in Yiddish as all the Jewish writers are communists and work upon the direct instructions of the Central Committee.

I am not inclined to feel that Gilichenskiy himself thinks that way. Most probably it is better for him to say this for others to believe. As for his words, I can say that if Sholom Alekhem was a communist, it would be a good thing. And I would also advise Zinovi to ask others why they have in their houses the books of Sholom Alekhem, Shraybman and Sandler, and why their works are freely published in the republic and in the nation?

The reading of the religious literature helped me be persuaded of the insincerity and some rigidity in Zinovi's words on the question of Yiddish. Here I was aided by the very authors who for Zinovi himself are classics. The book "The Land of the Lord! The Inner World of the Eastern European Jews" by Abraham Joson Heschel, a professor of Jewish ethics and mysticism at the American Jewish Theological Seminary (a publication of the Library Alia) has been translated by "samizdat" into Russian. Here I read: "The Jew from Eastern Europe was an unusual type of man. His habits and tastes did not correspond to the classic canons of beauty but nevertheless he had some melancholy charm. His appearance was not similar to the page of an open

book.... He rather was like a book the pages of which are constantly being turned. This charm came from the richness of the inner world."

And then on the Yiddish language: "Moreover, the Eastern European Jews, in desiring to make more accessible and to explain and simplify the extremely complex religious literature, establish their own language of Yiddish. It arose spontaneously and became a mother tongue for them "which it was possible to express their ideas and feelings...."

At times Zinoviyy also gave me "secular" literature to read. Basically these were translated publications, thick samizdat transcripts and booklets. I was also given to read...fables. At least that is how I christened them. As in all fables, here good triumphs and vice is punished. But a child quickly realizes that the hero, having carried out the next good deed, turns to all the witnesses of the miracle with an appeal to quickly return to the homeland, that the rabbi is always the embodiment of positive qualities and the non-Jew or goy for the negative ones, that the heroes will never forget their Jewish nationality and they do good not only for the sake of good but also in performing a mitzvah or rite. If fables have always been considered the precursor of education, then, in the intention of the compilers of this collection, the child without fail should be interested in that miraculous country where such heroes live.

For those who are older, of course, literature is something else. Here is what I found in one of the almanacs. Initially the engrossing essay "90 Minutes Over Entebbe" telling about the military operation by the Israeli Army and including all the elements of a promotional pamphlet. Then pages of poetry including delicate, lyrical verses. Then the story "Homewards" telling about the ordeals of an old Jew who traveled through a semi-destroyed Russia during the times of World War I, experienced all the terrors of war together with the Poles and Russians and then returned home. And at the end, a letter by V. Yevdokimov, one of the leaders of the Pamyat [Memory] Organization. It must be admitted that the compilers of the almanac are experts. Because after materials about the life of the Jews, after the poetry and the major key, a tub of slops is thrown at the same Jews. Naturally, the stereotype of comparison goes to work. Both V. Yevdokimov and all the non-Jewish people embodied in his last name cause revulsion in the reader. This, in my view, is the most vivid example of how two seemingly opposite phenomena operate as fraternal twins. Chauvinism and anti-Semitism are brought together to achieve a single aim of national prejudice.

Among the readers of such literature, suddenly there is a person who casts on the completely fertile ground a quote by the same Heschel: "In order to be a man, he (the Jew—I.L.) should be more than a man; in order to be a people, the Jews should be more than a people." Neither the author of this quote nor Zinoviyy Gilichenskiy

through whose hands it reaches the awareness of the reader is bothered by the fact that in essence it completely repeats the racial theory of Nazi Germany. More than a man is a superman and more than a people is the superpeople. The chosen race! Neither of them is bothered by the fact that the Jewish people are sick of such a state. After Babiy Yar, it sickens them a thousand-fold.

An interesting picture develops. Here in this country Zinoviyy complains that he is persecuted (they took away his literature!) and there (for example, in Israel) Heschel's quote automatically turns him from the persecuted into the persecutor, into a superman, in comparison with whom all the others are like dust.

But with Heschel himself another slit is made. Zinoviyy always tells me the same thing that a real Jew is the one already in Israel while Heschel says something else: "Here, in Eastern Europe, the Jewish people did not live as a guest in someone else's house, a guest who always had to consider the habits and way of life of the hosts: here the Jews lived without hiding, without putting on a mask in leaving their house for the street...."

Why then, please tell me, should we be pressed to be the "guest"?

Over our almost year-long acquaintance Zinoviyy offered me a whole "bouquet" of lessons. They were held not only at his house and in the synagogue. Once I received an invitation to a collective lecture. Certain persons were there whom I recognized from previously in exercises and at the synagogue. There were about a total of 20 people. But for some reason the lecture itself had not started. It turned out that it was to be given by a foreigner whom everyone was awaiting.

He was called Azavar Volzman. As he himself explained, he had arrived from Israel and was a citizen of Israel and Great Britain. He had with him a charming female companion. Volzman was a venerable man of some 60 years, with magnificent manners and a fine orator. There was emotion and an absolute openness in discussing the broadest spectrum of problems. Azavar Volzman approached the subject of the conversation in a somewhat unusual manner. Having started the discussion on certain ideas in the Torah, he suddenly switched to the question of illnesses, then moved back to Torah and again the talk turned to a different subject. In my view, a good three-quarters of those present ultimately left disappointed as the guest was unable to provide answers to the questions of interest to them. But this did not show in Volzman's mood. Satisfied with the meeting given him, he spoke in a lively manner with the remaining listeners, in periodically photographing with his Minolta.

Zinoviyy later explained that one should not expect more from this lecture in principle, as Volzman was merely passing through and had not prepared specially for the lecture. As for the special lectures, they were also given

by foreigners who answered the questions of those present. The questions, as a rule, were of an everyday sort such as how much a car or television costs in Israel, how to obtain housing and what was the situation with the language. Video films were sometimes shown to explain the answers.

Having learned that I was studying on the journalism faculty, Zinoviï became somewhat put out. Then he periodically asked me whether I knew Tronin. No, I was not acquainted with Tronin. But the question itself, as I realized, had been asked in line with the court case going on at that time. Zinoviï and his friends had brought charges against the correspondent of *Sovetskaya Moldaviya* for the defamation contained in the article about the "kings." Zinoviï spoke to me rather frequently about this trial. I endeavored to understand for what reason the author was being charged. I could not see any substantial charges from Zinoviï. As it turned out, Zinoviï himself did not see these arguments. Why make a fuss? Zinoviï replied simply: "The longer the case goes on, the better it is for us." Well, it may be cynical but it was clear.

Zinoviï and I had some serious arguments over this matter. I did not see in the article anything which could be grounds for an accusation. Zinoviï held the opposite opinion. But his facts were little persuasive: basically he argued that Tronin had supposedly erred, calling the lessons to study the language paid and that certain words emerging in the article from the mouths of the "heroes" could not have been said at that time. In a word, a rather hazy picture ensued. It was approximately as if two persons went to court over the differing definition of vocabulary and a sentence.

It also seemed extremely strange to me that Zinoviï would endeavor to prove to the court that he was actually a severely ill person and not merely "reporting himself" as such, as the article stated. I do not doubt that he was in fact ill, but he was very hard to catch at home, he was always out and his parents would reply over the telephone that "he will be back late, around 11."

Moreover, the very fact that Zinoviï did not repudiate the very essence of the article but merely certain details for me became the strongest argument in favor of the fact that the article was essentially correct. All in all, Zinoviï could only be content with this article because it became an unique advertisement for him and his friends.

Why then the court case? Zinoviï himself put it as follows:

"For noise. The more noise the more people will hear about us and our activities. Certainly I am not counting on success. But let it last a little longer."

This time seemingly he was sincere. But noise alone was not enough. The entire court trial was tape recorded. I do not know what further plans they are linking to it. But at least in one of the talks Zinoviï dreamingly said:

"They can take it to the West. And then flog it to some publication. Certainly the remuneration should be good."

There it was.... Constantly in the forefront was the idea but then things got around to money. What was more important?

Recently Zinoviï himself filed a complaint on the matter of Tronin's article. It turns out that after careful study, the "community" had concluded that Gilichenskiy had the most air-tight position on the events described in the article. He, consequently, had a strong hand. The idea was calculated with mathematical precision, approved and Zinoviï was selected to embody it in life. Some role. But seemingly he was completely content with it. And again he was preparing for court. And again he was absolutely certain that they would be unable to prove anything against him. And again a predisposition for extended noise. But if this is so, this must be necessary for someone. To whom could this be advantageous?

I am inclined to feel that in the very near future Zinoviï will leave the nation. In any event his apartment shows he is all packed up: the armoire has been sold, the books are packed and goals in mind. Probably it would not be good for Zinoviï to remain in our country. For a year now he has not been employed anywhere and is not studying, he does not have a specialty and, judging from everything, does not intend to acquire one.

As I myself am convinced, all Zinoviï's actions, if one views them all together, can only be called a deception. Judge for yourselves. A large portion of those wishing to leave now are going out of the country without problems. And to those who wish to leave but have not yet done so the Gilichenskiys stick like leeches. An illogical action results: the people do not seek them out (as is portrayed), but rather they seek out the people. Here everything has been thought out: one can depict oneself as a supporter, a fighter and true. Hence, in fact it is not for the sake of something but for...for oneself, for ensuring one's future and for one's appearance. For even some small but political capital.

I would not say that all these notions came to me all at once. They built up and finally ripened during our last talk with Zinoviï. This, in my view, is worth quoting as completely as possible.

"But don't you want to go to Israel?" Zinoviï asked me.

"This question has not come up for me."

"But this question should come up for all Jews. We, the Jews, are only home there."

"But that is their problem. Before leaving, as I understand it, any person should know the language, the rites and traditions."

"Of course, that would be desirable. But if you do not know this, leave all the same and you will learn everything there in 2 or 3 months.

"?"

"The main thing is to leave. Wherever you like—to America, Australia, only get out of this country as quickly as possible...."

As the English say, no comment.

From the Editors: We offer our excuses to Z. Gilichen-skiy for the fact that in April 1987, the article "Uncrowned Kings of 'Refusal'" called the courses for studying Modern Hebrew which he was involved in organizing and holding paid ones. These courses were actually free, for an idea. Let the readers judge what the idea itself was.

Pravda Hits Inequities in Ashkhabad Living Standards

18300338 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 89 p 3

[Article by M. Volkov, PRAVDA correspondent, Ashkhabad: "Palaces and Cottages of Daubed Brick or Wood: Why the Capital of Turkmenia Is Developing Slowly"]

[Text] A silvery liner hung in the midday mirage, entangled in the thick, blue-grey smog. The motors are roaring with effort, an airplane is moving directly to me, gleaming with rivets on the spacious fuselage. With a glance I follow this powerful, bulky and cumbersome object, the creation of human hands, and I go further, along the earthen, low duval [not further identified].

Behind the bend, camels, lazy and unruffled, are chewing the cud, they have become used to the roar of the iron birds. Hardly a small distance away, a tiny stack of hay, a neatly-formed hill of kizyak. To the left and to the right are cottages of daubed brick or wood, small children are romping in the roadside dust. This is what a republic newspaper wrote about them not long ago: They are not aware as yet, they do not know that they have it bad here.

...

And I am not roaming about in a settlement lost in the sands—[I am] in the capital of Turkmenia.

At the 9th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th Convocation in May of the past year, the chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers, A. Khodzhamuradov cited a painful fact:

—118,000 Ashkhabad citizens, almost half of the population, live in ill-equipped temporary structures. Those which they hastily built immediately after the terrible earthquake, which completely destroyed the city, carrying away 110,000 inhabitants. They built

them in 2-3 months, in terms of strength for a year, but they stand there already for 40 years.

Annamurad Khodzhamuradov at the session kept silent about the fact that the republic organs have at their disposal 820 million rubles, which in 1984 the government of the country allotted especially in order that only memories should remain of these very shacks. Plans called for the construction of almost 1.5 million square meters of housing.

The plans were grandiose. Many remember the pompous meeting of the republic party and economic aktiv, at which flowery and enthusiastic speeches were heard. The decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers "On Measures for the Further Development of the City Economy of Ashkhabad in the Years 1985-1990." Those who spoke declare that the decree of the party and the government will be fulfilled ahead of schedule!

Now it is extremely difficult to glance at the protocol of that meeting: It lies in the thick of paper stacks of the party archive, which, by the way, occupies a fine building in one of the central streets of the city. But we are still counting up these majestic buildings that rise over the Turkmen capital. Thus, I leaf through the protocol which I obtained in the archive. In general, the correct policy was set—aimed at the development of the capacities of the construction industry and the strengthening of the construction organizations.

The results are not comforting. Experienced people confirm that it cannot be otherwise. Since in those times, which were "sanctified" by the name of the former first secretary of the Turkmen CP Central Committee, M. Gapurov, the public assurances and promises on oath represented exactly nothing in comparison with the finger pointed in the silence of the office. And instead of following the officially outlined policy in accelerated fashion, the builders in the capital, with energy doubled by government investments, continued the installation of magnificent monuments.

Now all, as if by agreement, with an unkind word remember only the former chief architect of Ashkhabad, A. Akhmedov. Of course, not without reason, since this executor was full of initiative, talented moreover with inexhaustible penetrating force.

And indeed—well, where can one obtain so much concrete—the building material in extremely short supply! This thought comes to your mind when you enter the center of the capital, which is chained in reinforced concrete construction. Grandiose esplanades, covered with concrete slabs, cut the city far and wide. Massive buildings, endless stepped crossings—up, down, and again up. . . . And this in a level place! That is, the

crossings were created artificially, under them they assiduously dug foundation pits, they paved hills, and they were generous in expending marble and granite.

Tens of millions of rubles literally buried in the earth. Installation workers, whatever their number, and hundreds of citizens who became involved, also labored gloriously. The entire construction industry and equipment were thrown here. And at the end of the most intricate, many-tier esplanade, in front of the State Library imeni Karl Marx, surrounded on all sides by concrete installations reminiscent of pill-boxes (their purpose no one was able to explain to me), there rises a completely unidentified structure. In some way it looks like a space ship of strangers, in any case it does not remind one of anything earthly. According to the thinking of A. Akhmedov, its complex metallic design was to crown it.

Several months ago, a jolt of unprecedented force shook the city. It so happened that after a few minutes I was at the Karl Marx Square. An enormous crowd had gathered at the "space stranger." And why not? Against all expectations, in spite of all the calculations of the specialists, the delicate steel spire had collapsed in broad daylight.

"We lost 600,000 rubles," the new chairman of the gorispolkom, A. Bayramov, frowned. Aman Ovezovich and I engaged in some calculations. The "ship" cost the state more than 1.5 million rubles. What to do with it now, no one has thought of. The city authorities are equally unsuccessfully trying to figure out where to get another half a million rubles—for that sum, A. Akhmedov, as the curtain fell, arranged a contract for the art fund of Georgia for the design of the city post office, which itself is much more expensive. In its turn, his patron diverted all possible construction forces and materials to "its" projects. The Turkmen CP Central Committee built a monumental garage. Running ahead, I will say that a large plant has now been housed in the building. It has begun to erect a 12-story(!) addition to the Central Committee building, and it has buried hundreds of thousands of rubles in the foundation and the first stories. Irretrievably, because it is inexpedient to build further—such is the conclusion of the specialists.

The force of inertia is a powerful force. And here already the administrations of affairs of the Turkmen CP Central Committee and the Council of Ministers in 1987 develop tireless activity on the next prestige object—the polyclinic and hospital of the 4th administration of the Ministry of Health of Turkmenia, which, in general, were not organized badly even without this. The best construction subdivisions are drawn here, and soon a splendid building, trimmed with marble on the outside and inside, rose like on yeast. For the joy of the local apparatchiks and their close relatives.

All right, it is necessary to treat all. Who argues. I about another. Why, well why are some construction projects elevated to the rank of special projects! Are supplied

above the cooperatives, acquire finished forms quickly, and of high quality. And side by side. . . the music school has been under construction for 15 years. In the backyard, where the huts of the construction workers are, there is no movement. During the past year, it was planned to acquire a small sum in order to give the young musicians a big holiday. However, we will not without grounds accuse the managers of the subdivisions and their problems, they have, it must be understood, their own problems: To the higher authorities it is more evident where to use the labor of the workers. Frequent are also the curious incidents.

"They called me to the party gorkom," the Turkmen SSR deputy minister of trade, A. Akmamedov, recently reported in a phone call to the correspondents' center. "Aluminum stained-glass windows are needed, they say, by the city party conference, in order, they say, to put up a good front. . . . Not available, I answer. They were, but they have already been installed in the department store. Remove them, they demand, and after the party conference, take them back. . . .

But let us return to the Ashkhabad six-year plan—this is what local newspapers call the program outlined by the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers. Four years have passed, readers in letters to the correspondents' center insistently ask to be informed: What has been done? They are extremely perturbed by the fact that the terms for the construction of projects of vital importance for Ashkhabad have been ruined: Service establishments, hotels, the trolley bus depot, a central water junction, the bath house, the post office, the maternity hospital, and the "urgent care" hospital. According to the conclusion of the city plan, in terms of housing installation, the city lags behind the tasks by 100,000 square meters. About 15 million rubles have not been assimilated for the development of municipal services. A sad result, if you consider in addition that in terms of the provision of housing space Ashkhabad occupies the last place among the capital of the union republics and 22,000 families are waiting in line to receive housing. The demand of the city for schools has been met only to the extent of two-thirds, for kindergartens—to the extent of one-half, and the situation with hospitals is poor.

The Turkmen CP Central Committee Buro has twice reviewed the course of the realization of the decree. In the fall of 1986, the work of the party gorkom, the ministries and departments, and perhaps, also the republic Council of Ministers in terms of this decree was recognized as unsatisfactory. Two years later, during September of last year, the Central Committee Buro again arrived at the severe assessment—unsatisfactory.

And why? I go to the first deputy chairman of the Ashkhabad Ispolkom, E. Kovkov, who for 7 years has been taking care of construction in the capital. I am counting on the fact that Ernst Tikhonovich will explain why all these years sections have not been diverted for

individual construction. You see, the gorispolkom should have allotted a building site already in 1985 and should have supplied the population with the necessary materials. It was charged with erecting 40,000 square meters of housing a year through the "self-construction" method. E. Kovkov in surprise raised his eyebrows:

"What is that decree? So many of them go through my hands."

"The union ministries withdrew from the implementation of the decree—that is where the trouble lies," the chairman of the Turkmen SSR State Committee for Construction, A. Sviridov, believes. "They do not develop their own production bases in Turkmenia, and for social, cultural and consumer projects they do not deduct more than 12 percent of the capital investments.

What is correct, is correct. For example, the Turkmen gas workers, who have raised the republic to second place in the country in terms of the production of gas, have the right to expect greater concern from the USSR Ministry of the Gas Industry. But it is impossible not to note the obvious: The republic Council of Ministers also is making a mess of the tasks. The introduction of capacities of the woodworking combine, construction and steel construction plants, ready-mixed concrete, and asphalt concrete plants has been frustrated. The reconstruction of the construction materials combine has not been completed, the installation of the second house construction plant has not been begun, and the first is operating at full capacity.

And it would already be quite strange to hear from A. Sviridov about the shortage of specialists and house construction workers. This problem could be solved, the more so as it was mentioned in a careful manner at the

party and economic activists of the republic and in the city. But here, it turned out, there was bad luck: The construction departments did not show the proper concern, they did not extend practical assistance in the development of an instruction and material base of the local vocational-technical schools.

In short, wherever one looks, there is a wedge. At the same time, truly fantastic palaces stand empty in the city botanical garden. They are called unpretentiously—dacha No 1 and dacha No 2. I shall not begin to describe their architectural merits, their internal appointments, I will only say that they are done according to the highest stagnation canons, and millions of rubles belonging to the people were spent on them. But the people is not allowed to approach them. Day and night the "dachas" are unremittently guarded by militiamen on point-duty. Palaces have been conceived behind inaccessible metal fences for receptions of the highest guests, during the remaining time, that is for years, the highly-trained maidservant dies of boredom here. They live by one thought: And suddenly someone will come all the same. . . . Almost the same picture also in the spacious rooms of the building across the street, in the so-called government hotel "Yubiley-naya."

They built with scope. . . . But again they postponed the building of the concert hall, the skin and vein clinic, the House of Marriage, the covered swimming pool, and the new building of the Scientific Research Institute for oncology. But on the other hand, with the former zeal, from early morning to late at night, not knowing either Saturdays or Sundays, the builders have "ploughed" at putting on the finishing touches on the second hall for conferences in the Turkmen CP Central Committee, although there is already one, luxurious, capacious hall.

Whose office is next in line?

SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA Rebuts Accusations of Estonian-Language Press

18000590 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 10 Jan 89 p 4

[Unsigned article under the rubric "Topic of the Day":
"A Moment of Truth or the Truth of the Moment?"]

[Text] At this time there would probably be no point in relating the content of the rebuttal, "When the 'RADUGA' [Rainbow] Spectrum is Disrupted," which was published in SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA on 26 November last year. It is more important that the newspaper material maintained a very, very proper tone, and the youth newspaper was in no way accused of any "mortal sins." And to be quite honest about it, we intended to go no further than to respond to RADUGA on the topic which was raised: that is, were the ideas expressed by our reviewer true or untrue?

An answer appeared shortly thereafter in the writers' newspaper SIRP JA VASAR. And here it's one thing, that we are all well-acquainted with Alla Kallas (a former correspondent to MOLODEZHKA, and currently deputy editor of RADUGA), who could have made her views on the rebuttal known without a whole lot of trouble via SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA (Our colleague's material would no doubt have been run). But it's another matter that the center of gravity of the counter-argument was shifted here to a completely different plane—an accusation was leveled at not only the central press, but the entire Russian-language press in the republic.

One can get a certain impression of the style and tone of the statements by Alla Kallas from the following which, although taken out of context, nevertheless are the very same type of formulation: "attempts by the Russian language press to sow the seeds of conflict," "they are fanning the flames of international tensions," "a purposeful campaign of lies," "every morning you unfold the newspaper with the question, 'Now what have our colleagues done?'," "you can't re-educate the stagnant;" and so on and so forth. For a summary they present the author's emotionally-charged record of the opinions of officials at the Rakvere Meat Combine, or from two Tallinn polyclinics, or the public catering system: "If they are not capable of calling the Russian-language press to order, then they should open new newspapers, which will be translated from the Estonian language." And all of this with appeals addressed to the Estonian CP Central Committee...

And all this—let's call a spade a spade—is hardly an isolated instance or an exception. "Taking a tour" through the republic's Russian-language press in passing (And it's not hard to guess that SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA is what they have in mind), it has been almost an obligation of late, and it has been read from some rather high rostrums too (for example by ESSR Writers' Society Chairman V. Beekman—at a session of

the republic Supreme Soviet) and from many pages (say, the writer T. Kallas in SIRP JA VASAR); and what's more, without citing specific materials.

In order to understand the essence of the complaints, we spoke via telephone with both V. Beekman and A. Kallas. This time (as opposed to their statements "to the public"), they expressed themselves fairly peaceably.

Here is our dialogue with the chairman of the Writers' Society:

[Beekman] "You are delaying the reporting of important events."

[Ed.] "And just which ones, Vladimir Eugenovich?"

[Beekman] "Well, for example, in connection with working out the Law on the State Language. There were so many discussions..."

[Ed.] "And excesses also?"

[Beekman] "That can't altogether be denied. But you should have criticized them good and proper..."

But you see, we both presented and discussed them.

And here is our conversation with the deputy editor of RADUGA:

[Kallas] "The newspaper has not taken a position on the question of questions—the national one. Your readers do not even imagine all the aspects of the problem."

[Ed.] "And which ones, specifically?"

[Kallas] "All of them..."

Should I have gotten into an argument? Should we gather information, that testifies to the fact that last year we did give space to the state language, and to citizenship, and to cost-accounting, and other timely topics—and not only a line or an individual article: at times entire pages. Even before the appearance of the Popular Front, there were selections in the issues for 6 and 27 January, and 18 February. On 13 March there was a major article by M. Lauristin, "On the Problem of International Relations"; on 18 March, "Migration"; on 23 March an article by Academician V. Palm, "The Land and Us"; on 7 April, an entire page—"The time for Responsible Decisions"; and on 16 April, an interview with V. Beekman, "How our Words Were Received"...

To journalists, writers and public figures, this is better-known than to anyone else. We have published it more than once in SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, and have given interviews. Now, we do not want to say that we have been working in an ideal manner; but we cannot agree with the assertions that the newspaper has been intentionally avoiding the critical questions.

It's another matter, I think, that our newspaper raised many of the problems **differently** than the other republic and rayon publications, as well as radio or television.

Differently? How is that? We shall try to be more precise. Differently—means chiefly, taking into consideration the circumstance that the readership of SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA consists not only of Eston-landers, as they now say, but also the citizens of other republics of the USSR and a number of foreign countries as well. For better or for worse, you see, that is the way it has evolved: that on the whole the materials we have published have created the very broadest spectrum of public opinion surrounding the so-called "Baltic question," and the various movements and currents which have been borne on the wave of perestroika. This places a special responsibility on the editorial collective—Yes, yes, it is as it were a dual responsibility, which so often figures in an accusatory statement: Whom are you with, they say—with the republic or with the country?

We would answer the question like this: We do not believe that the interests of the republic and the interests of the country are always at odds. And in any case, they should not be. And it is precisely for this purpose, in illuminating the disagreements which have sprung up—whether they be between the union-level departments and territorial interests with regard to the Rakvere phosphate works, or the reconstruction of the Baltic GRES—we always try to objectively present the positions of both sides. (Perhaps one should remind you in this regard that the topics cited figured in our pages long before they were brought up for broad "meeting" discussion.)

Now here is a recent example. SIRP Ja VASAR, in no less than its first issue, gave space to a large article by T. Kallas, in which SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA was once again the object of reproach: an open letter from Academician M. Bronshteyn of the ESSR Academy of Sciences to PRAVDA Editor V. Afanasyev was not published, you see, at the same time in RAHVA HAAL, but later; moreover, the composing was identical with that of an interview given to the newspaper by another ESSR Academy of Sciences academician, G. Naan, printed earlier in PRAVDA. "The bias is completely obvious," postulates Kallas. And you see, that is absolutely correct. In the given instances it is obvious, for the newspaper **intentionally** strove to present the position of both sides. Does this really mean that we thereby somehow showed disrespect to M. Bronshteyn, an old friend and regular contributor to SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, where his most critical articles first saw the light of day? And was the contrast of views really not interesting? That is something any reader can do, without, as they say, budging from his seat. Furthermore, we knew that Academician Naan's article in PRAVDA met with sharp criticism in a number of republic "mass media" [sic]. But our mail contained letters in support of that article. And what, in that case does the term "pluralism" mean, if Naan's critics are given space, and he is not?

Kallas was also irritated by the position taken by Deputy S. Tarakanova at a Supreme Soviet session which examined the question of a state language. The writer noted with dissatisfaction that, "Tarakanova personally has no language problems, because it is not a matter of nationality." How is one supposed to understand this? Should one not take it, that an editor of a Russian republic newspaper has nothing more to worry about if he himself speaks Estonian? Yes, we have a lot of things that are different from what Kallas would like.

Different—that means also with respect to orientation on the peculiarities of perception of our readers: say for instance, certain individual aspects of life within the republic.

Do we, for example, need proof of the fact that the non-Estonian populace in the republic understood the aspirations and hopes connected with citizenship and a state language differently than the Estonians did? Yes, we could have published the most radical suggestions and demands without delay, and surrounded them with the appropriate "boom," as certain other of the mass information media did. What that would have led to—is today clear to many. Now it's easy to say that they would have argued, and dispersed peacefully. It's also easy to give advice—You just print it, and the people will figure out what's what. No, since we have begun to speak plainly, we can make the editors' point of view clear: they are extremist points of view, no matter to whom they belong, no matter what commentary accompanies them, and they could, they really could lead only to further aggravation of international relations. For the sake of fairness we note that, neither did we give space to those letters in which the demands and views of "the other side" were stated in a manner just as extreme.

In marking out the boundaries of the "printability" of this or that material, we cannot avoid confronting another reality, namely the national mentality. V. Beekman, speaking out at the session, was probably right in noting that the collectives of union-level enterprises (where, as everyone knows, a decisive majority consists of non-Estonians) "they have become accustomed to the situation, in which all good and proper laws come down from above, from Moscow." On our own behalf we can make it clear, that life has shown that such laws are not the only kind that issue from Moscow. And you see, practical experience in lawmaking at the republic level is not without fault either.

All right then, what should come of it? Should there be a face-off between union-level and local lawmakers, as some have hastened to propose in certain movements and groupings? Who is "for Moscow," and who is "for Tallinn"? We do not exclude the possibility that SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA would not be very popular among certain circles in that instance. But its popularity would be lost among that part of the public which seeks (and we would like to think—will find) pre-eminent journalistic positions in the newspaper, and even the

"voice of Moscow," which as before is still trusted no less than other "voices." But does this really mean that the interests of the republic are not important to us? Is it really not on behalf of those interests that the majority of our publications have appeared on problems of khozraschet, the ecology and culture in the republic?..

But let us talk some more about the subject of journalistic "boldness." Not so long ago, in the pages of SIRP JA VASAR, the establishment of OSTK [United Council of Working Collectives] was characterized in passing as a "dubious enterprise," and a "conspiracy of union-level plant directors."

What do you call this? Was it the author's "boldness" or the editors'?

The essence of our unhappiness with such labels lies not only, and not even as much, with the fact that a number of journalists at SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA look upon OSTK as an essentially serious movement, and not simply one capable of rallying the working class and the technical intelligentsiya around the ideas of perestroika—but also as one capable of genuine action for strengthening the republic's socio-economic potential.

Another essential part of our unhappiness lies in the fact we have not and do not believe that pinning on labels is of itself a method of objection and argument.

For example, the journalists on the editorial staff do not agree with all the premises of the Popular Front of Estonia [NFE]. Moreover, time has shown that certain NFE leaders have today renounced a great many of their previous theses. Nevertheless, one should not expect to find demeaning definitions or gloating interpretations in our newspaper. We have offered the floor to both the adherents and the opponents of the NFE platform, and have only insisted that the discussions be conducted in a gentlemanly manner; we have published practically all the program documents of this movement as soon as they came to light, and the leaders of NFE have had an opportunity to acquaint our reading audience with their views and plans.

At the same time we would like to point out that similar materials from OSTK were given timely publicity only in our pages. After the memorable (and to our chagrin) breakup of the working collectives into "Council" and "Union," SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA was the first to offer the floor to the leaders of OSTK [United Council of Working Collectives] and STKE [Union of Working Collectives of Estonia] in order to expound their positions. And we refrained from "calling to order" other publications, believing this absolutely inappropriate; and chiefly, unethical. Although, we repeat, quite a few letters accumulated in the editor's mailbag on that regard as well.

It should be clear, that all the aforementioned (or, more precisely, afore-printed) hardly signifies that SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA has some sort of "mandate" of last instance on truth. No one here is harboring any nostalgia for the days when criticism in the official organ of the Estonian CP Central Committee and the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers (which, as is well-known, was the status of our newspaper) was perceived as the coordinated "verdict" of all the aforementioned institutions. On the contrary: we are prepared to offer the floor (and space in the paper) for the most serious complaints and remarks addressed to us—with only one proviso: we retain the right to expound our own point of view as well. Based upon, if formulated as a whole, the political line of the 19th Party Conference, and the 11th and 13th Estonian CP Central Committee Plenums. So much on the question of fairness.

As far as the question of truth is concerned...

The term "moment of truth" is now well-established in works of fiction. There is only one unconditional requirement in it, and that is—truth. We stand for the applicability of the criterion of truth to any accusation, whether hurled from the rostrum, or from the pages of a printed publication. We are for the moment of truth, and not for the truth of the moment. Let us not confuse these concepts, esteemed colleagues.

Estonian Writer Details Criticism of Republic Russian-Language Press

18000567 Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian
12 Jan 89 p 2

[Interview with Teet Kallas, prose writer and secretary of the Estonian Writer's Union Governing Board, by MOLODEZH ESTONII correspondent Ella Agranovskaya: "Not as Justification"]

[Text] The secretary of the Estonian Writer's Union Governing Board, prose writer TEET KALLAS writes a column in the newspaper SIRP JA VASAR, which may be literally translated as "The state of the moment". In the materials under this column heading, the writer expresses his point of view on current events, analyzing the situation in the republic. In a number of recent publications he has expressed serious pretensions against the Russian-language press, and specifically MOLODEZH ESTONII. Our correspondent Ella Agranovskaya talks with Teet Kallas on this subject.

[Agranovskaya] In our relations, and I am referring, of course, not to our personal relations, but to the newspaper MOLODEZH ESTONII, a strange tendency has become evident. You express your dissatisfaction with us on the pages of the newspaper SIRP JA VASAR, and we respond to you in our own columns. Perhaps, instead of exchanging mutual reproaches in different publications it would be better to meet honestly face to face?

[Kallas] With pleasure.

[Agranovskaya] Could you formulate the pretensions addressed not to the Russian-language press in general, but to our newspaper in particular?

[Kallas] Let us agree at the outset. That which you call pretensions and I call criticism refers to last year. I sincerely hope that not only I, but many others, will not have to repeat the words which have already made our mouths sore. After all, in essence the opinions of your opponents converge. Let me cite one example. One of my colleagues, Ago Sisask, editor of the "Looming Library" has spoken to various Kokhtla-Yarve audiences. One audience turned out to be very difficult, quite honestly, even aggressive. For 5 minutes they did not even let him talk and showered him with the customary accusations. Yet the topic of the discussion was to be the draft of the Law on Language. But the public did not know that Ago Sisask was a very meek person. He had studied 5 years in Leningrad and knew how to act in this case. He jumped up onto the table and tossed out a few choice expressions, after which the audience grew silent. Comments were heard such as: "That means he is one of the workers if he..." And they began to listen. After half an hour everyone was on his side, and questions ensued such as: "So why are the newspapers lying to us?"

[Agranovskaya] I readily believe that that is just how it was. There was a purely psychological mechanism acting here. The people were filled with admiration for a speaker who would not back down, and one always wants to believe a likeable person. Yet someone is at fault, and consequently we must find this "extreme". Or do you too believe that the Russian-language newspapers are lying?

[Kallas] The newspapers, of course, do not lie. It is just that they are not at the proper level. Not only MOLODEZHKA, not only SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, but in some places, we must admit, even the Estonian newspapers. They are not at the level of 1988, a very historic year for us. We were not able to keep up with the events. And, to the praise of MOLODEZHKA, from April through June it was simply brilliant. The newspaper reflected the situation in the republic. It was the first to publish the documents of the unified plenum of the artist's unions.

[Agranovskaya] We will not tell at length what this cost us at the time. We had to overcome not only our own thinking, but also the pressure from above. I will note, however, that the Council on Culture demanded the publication of these documents, but at the same time was in no hurry to hand them over to us.

[Kallas] However, I must note that, although this was probably not done intentionally, the newspaper should not have headlined the speech of Lennart Meri with the appropriate commentary by A. Maloveryan. Whether you intended this or not, it had a negative effect on your readers.

[Agranovskaya] This was the decision of the Komsomol Central Committee—to publish Lennart Meri in MOLODEZHKA and NOORTE HAAL on the same day.

[Kallas] You see, the Komsomol Central Committee also did not take into consideration the difference in audiences. Because then my colleagues and I had to explain repeatedly at meetings with Russian audiences that this is not nationalism (by the way, we will return to it again), that Lennart Meri has for many years been known to the Estonian reader, and that the presentation was merely a continuation of his many years of analysis. Yet in Russian, taken out of context, it, of course, sounded shocking.

This fact was eagerly used by Academician Gustav Naan, who declared that Estonians should not panic, that there were as many of them as there were before. Here he for some reason totally overlooked the percentage ratio, and such manipulations are not at the academic level. It is perfectly clear to me as a writer that Naan returned in his articles to the style used in the late 40's-early 50's.

[Agranovskaya] In general, we must enhance the knowledge of the readers. I would like to note that MOLODEZHKA published far from just one article which sounded shocking to the Russian-language reader. And although I personally did not undertake such a task, as you yourselves can guess, each of my interviews with leaders in literature and art, as well as with the People's Front, evoked a squall of indignation. Yet you will note that such a complex thing as policy is not formed in one hour, and in those 9 months which have passed since the moment of our first interview the psychology of our reader has changed drastically. People have stopped reacting acutely and painfully to that which in April of last year seemed simply blasphemous to them. People have begun to analyze and compare instead of expressing outright indignation. Why is this exhausting struggle with stagnant thinking not credited to the Russian language press?

[Kallas] In my opinion, MOLODEZHKA has found itself in a difficult position. And this, of course, we can understand. Yet the situation has become even more complicated by its dual role—the role of one of the mouthpieces of the Intermovement, towards which some strict but just words have finally been expressed. At the present time this is a very extremist movement. And although the slogans over the heads of these people are rather noble, the movement itself was born of negation. The People's Front was created in support of perestroika, with a positive program which it immediately announced. The Intermovement, however, unfortunately has turned out merely to play the role of negator of the People's Front.

[Agranovskaya] It seems to me that the emergence of the Intermovement was engendered not by the program of

the People's Front, but by its mistakes. Had the Russian-speaking population not found itself removed from the center of its attention, there would have been no Inter-movement.

[Kallas] In my opinion, you are idealizing. Let us turn for greater objectivity to the Latvian situation. Recently one of the proponents of the Latvian Interfront announced on Central Television that: "The People's Front of Latvia has tipped the boat so much in one direction, that only we have been able to save the situation by balancing it". Yet let us decipher these words. The Latvians in their own homeland have so greatly lost their sense of measure, that again the Russians had to save the day. Excuse me, but this is a very old model, when in any situation the Russian turns out to be right.

[Agranovskaya] Yet in Estonia, when the Inter-movement was being born, the newspaper did not feel it had the right to deny it a voice. We will note that our newspaper also entered into polemics with it, which for some reason you preferred to overlook.

[Kallas] Yet everyone noticed that an entire column was given to one of the Inter-movement leaders, Yevgeniy Kogan. I do not want to personally ascribe any characteristics to him, because the man has found himself in misfortune, and it would be unseemly to discuss him now. Yet, as subsequent events showed, some Inter-movement leaders have crossed all boundaries. And why have the sane thinking people from the Inter-movement not yet given a proper evaluation to Oleg Morozov, who at the meeting slandered the doctors of the first aid hospital, who were supposedly gathering patient signatures for changes in the Constitution, or they would not treat them. Why, this is slander!

[Agranovskaya] Yet you must agree that it was not the Russian-language press, and specifically not our newspaper who suggested this to him.

[Kallas] Of course, MOLODEZHKA is not at fault here. Yet it was very apparent that in complex situations, in spite of the best intentions, there was no discernible line by the editorial staff.

[Agranovskaya] You subjectively believe that we had [no such line], but I believe just as subjectively that we did. Since we have our own reader who, you must agree, is different from the Estonian reader, and we do not have the right to undermine his trust in us. Otherwise, he will simply cease to listen to us. And if we do not allow him to express his opinions on the sorest problems, he will justifiably accuse us of trying to shut him up. You are a writer and well aware of how necessary it is for a writer to have a dialogue with his reader. For a newspaper this is twice, three times as important. Who needs a newspaper that the reader does not respect and ignores? And, it seems to me, we deserve considerable credit for the fact

that today the situation in Estonia has the tendency to support perestroika on the basis of consolidation of sane-minded people, regardless of their nationality. We are quite proud of this.

[Kallas] I must agree with you that your newspaper has practically never sunk to the level of the domestic squabble on national soil. And this, of course, is to its credit. Yet when I read your response to my last presentation in SIRP, I was simply surprised and even confused by the fact that we are seemingly talking about different things. I am referring to this exchange over the movement which I call "the plot of directors of union plants". From the very beginning it appeared to be political and desirous of siezing power in the republic, no more and no less. And there is nothing surprising in the fact that ultimately there was no consolidation with the Estonian collectives, although probably Comrades Yarovoy and Shepelevich already wanted this. The inertia of disunity which they set was too great.

[Agranovskaya] Then again, other Russian newspapers gave space to leaders of both meetings and painted an objective picture, although I am embarrassed to present this argument, since I always get the feeling that I am trying to justify myself. I even know where it came from: from the Russian-language press (willingly or unwillingly), where the "image of the enemy" has been created. But you and I understand that to work in an atmosphere of constant and frequently unjust accusations is intolerable. I am not an "enemy" and never have been, but I work at the "enemy" newspaper MOLODEZH ESTONII, which is always being forced to defend its position. This is in spite of the fact that people are finding out the truth about Estonia not from some "outside" sources, but specifically from here, from Pyarnu Maantee, 67-a.

[Kallas] The MOLODEZHKA really is not a very popular newspaper...

[Agranovskaya] You will not deny this?

[Kallas] Not in any case! Last year I did not receive it, but this year I subscribed so that I could read it fully, and not just those issues where they decline my name, which people eagerly gave to me. I will tell you honestly that Solovyeva's letter from Paldiski was the first time in my life that I learned that there is something wrong with my ethics.

[Agranovskaya] You see how unpleasant it is to have to listen to unjust accusations?

[Kallas] Of course, I could get over it, were it not for the question of what right does Kallas have to touch upon the Russian-language press. Yet one newspaper is called MOLODEZH ESTONII, and the other—SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA. I believe that this has direct relation to me, since I am an Estonian. Your newspapers are read beyond the boundaries of the republic, and read with great interest. They told me in Moscow

and Leningrad that certain issues do not even get to the subscribers, especially those containing controversial materials. That means that the Russian-language press has an interest in us, and this interest is now very great. And, if the problems of the republic are not illuminated in it proportionally, then it is quite clear that there will be distortions.

[Agranovskaya] This means, in your opinion, that the number of Russian-language newspapers should not be reduced? Two republic newspapers—that is not too much? Or is it excessive?

[Kallas] In my opinion, there should be more of them. I believe there is still a great need for a reliable weekly publication which could discuss our problems in detail without constrictions of space. And oh, how many problems there still are! There are more than enough for just a single newspaper. Also, we must speak more about the general things, about that which concerns all of us. I am sometimes simply amazed at what is going on in our country in the background of perestroika. We say words which are very much needed, but when the documents come out, we see that they are clearly counter to all these words. To me as a writer, the law prohibiting publisher's cooperatives was simply a spit in the face. Thus, I find myself in the same company with counterfeiters. Well, when they prohibit private coining of gold, that you can understand. But how can you understand the prohibition to make medicines? Perhaps some mad doctor wants to poison all mankind? Yet the only cooperative which justifies itself is "Kupar". These are 11 Estonian writers, among whom are the popular Estonian writer Yaan Kross, as well as Enn Vetemaa and Mati Unt. Well, are we really that dangerous to the state? This, after all, is regular proof of what centralization brings the country to. Let Russia know its polygraphic capacities. Perhaps, for technical and other reasons, it is really too early to raise this matter there. This is exclusively Russia's matter. Yet if Estonia has been able to handle it, then it is nevertheless a republic matter.

[Agranovskaya] I agree with you absolutely. After all, if our publishers are not able to handle the publication of books, there must necessarily be a competitor who is able to do so.

[Kallas] And, I assure you, neither I nor anyone else has yet gotten rich on this. On the contrary, people are depriving themselves of many things. Kheyno Kiyk, for example, has not been writing books for a year, but is working on the cooperative. I have not been writing for 3 years, and the cooperative also has played its specific role in this. As for many energetic Russian fellows who have created, for example, a video cooperative, this too is now banned. Again there is a wave of prohibitions! Yet there is a supplemental point there which states that the republics can ban certain other things. I can imagine what will happen in Central Asia. There they will prohibit everything, just in case. And again we will argue, and it will be the same thing all over again...

[Agranovskaya] Unfortunately, we seem to have some kind of flaw which keeps us from seeing all the phenomena in their development and in perspective. We might ask, what did we need to create a unified Young Pioneer newspaper for (although at the time we insisted on the incorrectness of this decision), if now to raise the question of separating SYADE and ISKRA? And who can provide assurance of the fact that someone will not get the "bright" idea of merging MOLODEZHKA and NOORTE HAAL so that in 10 years we can lament about how incorrect and irrational this was. After all, the idea has already been born that both these newspapers must be purely Komsomol organs. The publishing house of the Komsomol Central Committee, by analogy with the publishing house of the party Central Committee—this notion we can fathom, but what is a "purely Komsomol" newspaper?

[Kallas] I have a complaint against your newspaper, but I never denied the fact that it is interesting to a very broad readership. Last year, it seems to me, MOLODEZHKA was somewhat nervous and had lost its equilibrium a bit. And now I would expect more solidarity from it, but not boredom. A boring newspaper is a finished newspaper. And perhaps, there should be greater orientation toward the youth, and I emphasize, specifically the youth. This is because the Komsomol as a phenomenon in our state is a rather controversial phenomenon, if even the Komsomol leaders criticize it so strongly at the all-union level. There is hardly any need to artificially resurrect its problems. Yet we must be concerned with youth problems, of which we have an abundance. Especially since in our republic these problems differ greatly from those of other regions of the country. When we speak of the future of Estonia, we are referring, of course, to all of its population. The future lies specifically with those who are now finishing school, or even younger. The future lies with those who have not yet been spoiled by our mistakes. It is they who demand greater attention. Who else but a Russian youth newspaper will help its readers to prepare for the specific, real life in a specific republic? I would not like the newspaper to look like these all-union textbooks, where not one word is said about one's native city or street, yet there are many vague and general words. I am not saying that MOLODEZHKA did not write about this before, but it was the specific approach which was lacking. After all, the young people are not so heavily encumbered with dogmas. I have noticed that it is much easier and more pleasant to speak with Russian students than with older people.

[Agranovskaya] This is natural. Their thinking is more active.

[Kallas] And it is specifically MOLODEZHKA which holds all the cards in bringing up the citizens of Estonia.

[Agranovskaya] I assure you, this can be done only on a mutual basis.

[Kallas] Obviously, it is quite clear that we will not get far on endless arguments and mutual insults. I personally call myself toward maintaining my balance, since I too am not always restrained when something deeply offends me. Using this opportunity, I would just like to note that the only country in the world where the word "nationalism" is an expletive is the Soviet Union. I even became upset with the BBC and Voice of America when they spoke of "Estonian nationalism" or "Latvian nationalism". Recently an international meeting was held in Tallinn, where political terminology was clarified. I had suspected even earlier, but now I can say precisely that "nationalism" in other countries means simply patriotism in regard to one's country. They proudly say: Yes, I am a nationalist. I love my country and my people. I would like others to respect it too, and I, in turn, am ready to respect theirs. It is very simple and very good. And there is nothing criminal about it.

LaSSR Youth Paper Interviews Visiting European Parliament Members

18000574 Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH
in Russian 14 Feb 89 p 3

[Interview with Hans Joakhim Zeyeler: "Latvia: A View from the European Parliament. A Delegation of the Baltic Intergroup of the European Parliament Visited Riga Last Week"]

[Text] The European parliament is one of the leading organs of the European Community (European Economic Community, European Coal and Steel Community and the European Atomic Energy Community). Many countries—members of the European Community—associate plans for accelerating the process of integration with the activity of the European parliament. Attempts are being made to expand the authority of the European parliament and to give it a supranational character. A lot of attention is being given at sessions of the European parliament to questions of political cooperation and to pressing international problems.

Our correspondent met with Hans Joakhim Zeyeler just before the departure of the members of the Baltic intergroup for Tallin. By that point in time the guests were able to sum up their impressions of meetings with A. Gorbunov, chairman of the presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, members of the Duma of the National Front of Latvia, representatives of the Catholic Church and informal groups and movements, and to form a definite notion of today's Latvia.

[Avdevich] What was the purpose of your visit to the Baltics?

[Zeyeler] Our visit was unofficial. All of us are members of the Baltic intergroup. This is an informal association inside the European parliament. Therefore, we are interested in everything that is associated with the Baltic states.

[Avdevich] Before arriving here, of course, you had certain information about developments [protssessy] in the Baltics. Did what you expected to see in fact correspond with what you did see?

[Zeyeler] I can only speak for myself personally. This is my first time in this part of Europe. Of course, there was a certain notion. But to read about developments is one thing. And it is quite another thing to see everything for yourself. This makes a much stronger impression. Here we talked a lot with various people and tried to understand how they live, what problems trouble them and what they think about their future.

[Avdevich] Indeed, you became familiar with various points of view about the political situation in Latvia—you talked with President Gorbunov, members of the Duma of the NFL, representatives of the clergy and of informal movements. Whose position seemed to be more interesting?

[Zeyeler] The position of the National Front, as the most sensible one. The others, it seemed to me, had too many illusions. In my opinion, it is possible to move forward successfully only gradually, step by step.

[Avdevich] Our country practically has no democratic traditions. We are only beginning to learn democracy. What is your opinion about the level of political culture here?

[Zeyeler] The lack of traditions of democracy of the entire Soviet Union concerns more than the Baltic states. Here, in Latvia, there was a period, true, a very brief one, when there was, nevertheless, a little democracy. One senses this. A long difficult road of democratic reforms now faces the Soviet Union. And it seems to me that Mikhail Gorbachev is on the right path here.

I would like to add that the Soviet Union is the only state in the world that in the past century, like Britain, Germany and other major powers, seized a lot of foreign territories and has retained them up to the present time. Now is the right time for the federalization of these states and their decolonization. I think that the internal policy has to consider that the Baltic states, in contrast with other territories of the Soviet Union, had their own state organizations for a certain time, and that everything that is happening must be examined in this context. The people of the Baltics must have the right to decide their own destiny—including the question of whether to be an organic part of the USSR or to use the right of self-determination in another way.

[Avdevich] The general tendency of world development today is a tendency toward expansion of contacts, the free movement of people, ideas and capital, and toward a reduction in the factor of state organization. This is evident in the creation of the Common Market, plans for the introduction of an all-European passport, all-European currency. . .

[Zeyeler] At first glance, it can seem that the introduction of their own citizenship in the Baltic states contradicts the general tendency. But it seems to me that there is no problem in the fact that the Baltic republics will have their own citizenship. For example, on the territory of my country, in Germany, the different lands also had their own citizenship.

[Avdevich] Up until when was this?

[Zeyeler] Up to 1930. This helped the people to preserve their uniqueness. But the question of citizenship has to be approached very carefully. So that the resolution of this question does not conflict with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

As for the talk about a separate currency for each republic, I think this would be an unwise step. The Baltic states are too small to have their own monetary system. The economic conditions are not there for this. Although, it is possible that it makes sense to introduce a common Baltic ruble for all three Baltic states. So that this would be a convertible currency.

[Avdevich] Before arriving in Riga, your delegation visited Lithuania. What, in your view, is the difference in the situation in these two republics?

[Zeyeler] A very different cultural and historical background. Regarding today's situation, the difference, first of all, is that in Latvia the question of ethnic identification is very critical. But the positions of the restructuring movements—the National Front of Latvia and the Lithuanian "Sayudis"—as far as I could tell in 2 days, coincide in general.

[Avdevich] How do you evaluate the overall result of the visit of the delegation of the European parliament to Latvia?

[Zeyeler] The most impressive thing was meeting the people, who are filled with love for their motherland and a desire that it have a new and happy history. It seems to me that what is happening here is in the interests of perestroika in the entire Soviet Union. In the sense of searching for and trying new solutions, the Baltic states are in the vanguard.

[Avdevich] Your impression of the people of Latvia?

[Zeyeler] Riga, like my native Hamburg, is a Hanseatic city. Therefore, I felt very comfortable here. The people here are very much like my fellow countrymen—in character, temperament and way of thinking.

[Avdevich] Can one expect a broadening of contacts between Latvia and the European parliament in the near future?

[Zeyeler] Of course. It is true that we are now at a tense time—elections to the European parliament will be held in June. But after the elections, I think, the Baltic intergroup will again send a delegation and will invite representatives of the NFL and "Sayudis" for a visit to Western Europe. At the end of February, one of the members of our delegation will be on an official visit to Moscow, and talks will be held, in particular, about the Baltic states.

[Avdevich] Thank you for the interview.

LNIM Activists Present Group's Views in LaSSR Youth Paper Interview

*18000573 Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH
in Russian 14 Feb 89 pp 2-3*

[Article by Sergey Malakhovskiy and Yevgeniy Orlov, under rubric "Conversations in Room 1108":
"Understand Our Pain!"]

[Text] Of all the conversations in Room 1108, this was the longest.

And it is no accident that, during the course of four hours, SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH journalists directed numerous questions at Uldis Neybergs and Visvaldis Mutseniyeks, who, as representatives of the Latvian National Independence Movement [LNIM], for the first time were giving such an extensive interview with the republic's press.

For completely obvious reasons, we are publishing only that part of the tape-recorded material which provides the opportunity first of all for the interviewed persons to express their views.

All right, then, the Latvian National Independence Movement. It considers as its starting point the appearance of the resolution of the United Plenum of the Creative Unions of Latvia (June 1988); and the date of its formation, 10 July 1988, when the first public statement by the LNIM organizing body was made.

[Question] For the past half-year, the activities of LNIM have been on view by the entire republic. Various opinions exist concerning you and your fellow-thinkers. There are people who feel that the Latvian National Independence Movement unites within its ranks "fascists," "nationalists," etc. Exactly who are you, and what goals do you set for yourselves?

[V. Mutseniyeks] We are aware of those definitions. But they will have to remain on the conscience of those who express them. LNIM is a sociopolitical organization, the goal of which is to achieve the independence of Latvia in order to assure the survival of the Latvian nation. That goal is our basic one.

The republic has a large number of problems: economic, ecological, national, and interethnic. We must resolve them without any diktat from the outside. Complete independence, obviously, is impossible, and we understand that. But we want to decide for ourselves what part of this independence we can forgo, and what part we cannot. We put into the concept "independence" purely political meaning: the Latvian nation itself must rule its country. We do not demand any "racial purity," but our measures are necessary in order to assure that the Latvian nation not only survives, but also flourishes on its territory.

[Question] Could you please describe the makeup of the movement.

[U. Neybergs] LNIM includes the most diverse people—from a scientific associate to an ordinary laborer. Some of the members suffered during the bad years for their convictions. Although, if one knows history, one can conclude that the entire Latvian nation—without exception—suffered. I am surprised even more by the negative evaluation of our movement that is made by the Latvian Communist Party. I do not understand: in other countries where there are national movements, the communist parties, as a rule, are heading them! Our party itself has admitted the distortions in its previous policy, and has begun using the terms "totalitarian regime," "corruption," and "stagnation." And the fact that our movement has been causing the party's counteraction at precisely this time leads one to definite reflections, because the party is well aware of our misfortunes: in Riga, less than half the population is Latvians; Latvia has cities where one hears Latvian only rarely; there are no local newspapers in the native language... And one can add to that the ecology and the economy. Latvia is saturated with plants, but is not becoming richer from them. Where's the logic of this? I completely agree with the policy that gives priority to agriculture, because throughout its history Latvia has been an agrarian country.

Our industry has been developing in accordance with certain absurd principles: raw materials are shipped in, and the output is shipped out. I don't know who this is profitable to, but it certainly is not our republic. Another situation that is linked with the extensive method of management is the bringing in of manpower from outside. This is the very kind of migration that we have been fighting...

[Question] The very name of LNIM contains the word "national." Does this mean that participation in the movement is limited on the basis of nationality?

[V. Mutseniyeks] We do not make any limitations whatsoever for participation in the movement. The only criterion is the person's honesty. A person's party membership, religious affiliation, or nationality do not play any role. At the present time the persons who constitute

the overwhelming majority in the movement are Latvians, and this is easy to explain. The problems raised by us pertain most of all specifically to Latvians. Others do not experience these problems so painfully (if at all). We are not offended by the fact that the Russian-speaking population has been participating almost not at all in our movement, because we understand that our pain does not affect them in the same way. For a Russian, the territory of Latvia constitutes 0.3 percent of the territory of the USSR, but for us, it is our Homeland. And it is entirely possible that we will achieve independence, but this will be **not our** independence, since we shall continue to be in the minority and all the problems will continue to exist. It is precisely for this reason that we demand the priority for the indigenous population. I feel that we have the moral and legal right for this.

[Question] How many participants does LNIM have and what is the geography of the movement's activities?

[V. Mutseniyeks] The activities of 6000 members of LNIM extend to the entire republic. We have a somewhat more difficult time in the eastern part of Latvia, where the size of the Latvian population, in general, is small. We have information that in a few places the local authorities are going so far as to ban the raising of the national flag—in Daugavpils, Kraslava... This list could be extended.

[Question] Wherein do you see the first-priority task of LNIM?

[V. Mutseniyeks] We want the Latvians to understand that they are no worse than others and that their struggle for their rights is not illegal. And if that struggle causes some people to experience inconveniences, then the Latvians are not to blame for that. Latvians must feel that they are people too. They are a nation that does not need any shouts from the outside, or any directive instructions about how they should live or work, how songs they should sing, or what holidays they should celebrate. The Latvian nation must understand that it has its own history and culture, which must be preserved and developed.

[Question] And then?

[V. Mutseniyeks] The question is a rather complicated one. We are in favor of the democratic process and we do not recognize any coercive actions. Therefore we do not have too many work forms. We can make demands, we can collect signatures, we can appeal to the local and Moscow authorities, and we can attract the attention of international organizations. We shall support in the elections those candidates who understand our problems and are ready to resolve them. We shall fight for the Latvian language, for returning to it the positions that have been lost as of today.

[Question] Some of the republic's population adhere to the opinion that measures of this kind will be carried out to the detriment of the other nations in Latvia...

[V. Mutseniyeks] To the detriment of the minorities? So far as we know, in prewar Latvia during the period of the **democratic** republic, there were no problems such as the interethnic ones we have today. There were cultural societies and national schools, and not a single nation felt that it was being infringed upon. We are convinced that, as far as the minorities are concerned, they too can only win from independence.

[Question] What is your attitude toward the recommendation concerning the introduction of the status of Latvian citizenship?

[V. Mutseniyeks] The question of citizenship is a touchy one and it intimidates many people. This is our position: without a doubt, the indigenous population and their descendants were, are, and will remain citizens of Latvia. As for everyone else, we need a special approach. How can one recognize as being a citizen of Latvia a person who is against the republic's sovereignty, who does not recognize the right of the indigenous nation to have a normal existence, or who does not have any perception of its culture? It would turn out that, by granting him that citizenship, we would even be debasing him! The persons who have been released from incarceration and who are trying to make a living: where will they live? We have more than enough of our own criminals, so I do not see any sense in granting citizenship to them.

And with respect to the minorities... We feel that a person has the right to demand the granting of citizenship after living in the republic for 15 years. But if, by his actions, he has proven that he is a patriot of Latvia, he can also obtain that citizenship earlier. But if someone has not become a citizen of the republic, that certainly does not mean that he will be evicted. On the contrary, he can live here, work here, get an education, and enjoy medical services, etc. But the only people who will deal with questions of a state nature are the citizens of Latvia.

[Question] Could you refine this model: will citizenship be granted to everyone who lived in Latvia prior to the introduction of the status of "citizen of the republic," or will someone compute who has been living in Latvia for how long?

[V. Mutseniyeks] Of course we shall compute that.

[Question] How will this be one, practically speaking, and who, in your opinion, will determine who the "worthy" individuals are?

[V. Mutseniyeks] It will be necessary to develop the appropriate law or instructional guide. For the time being, we are only proposing the idea and, of course, we lay no claim to any monopoly in the search for the only correct decision.

[U. Neybergs] When the state language is introduced, many people will leave by themselves, including those who have lived in Latvia for 40 years and who now are discussing the lack of necessity to grant privileges to the Latvian language. But those who love their own culture—Ukrainian, Polish, Russian—will also be able to accept and love our Latvian culture. Many people think that adaptation under conditions that are new to them will be very complicated and painful. I personally do not feel that way.

[Question] What is your movement's attitude toward LPF [Latvian People's Front] and IF [Interfront]?

[V. Mutseniyeks] The people of Latvia, most of which is made up of Latvians, united into the People's Front in order to resolve the problems that had become critical. And the fact that there were few Russians who joined proves once again that these problems are of little concern to them.

As for Interfront... We expected its appearance, and that appearance also is completely natural. But inasmuch as the overwhelming majority of the participants are Russians, the question arises: against whom and against what will they fight? In order to resolve problems of the economy and the ecology, they were called into the LPF... There are almost no creative intellectuals in Interfront. There are also almost no workers. But there are middle-level chiefs who are afraid of losing their privileges. They represent those very enterprises that the republic will have to reject in the future.

[U. Neybergs] I do not understand why the concept "internationalism" in the word "Interfront" is used against the indigenous population. Internationalism actually means giving unselfish assistance to the nation that needs that assistance. When Israel annexes Arab territories, that is called colonization. But what if we begin to carry out parallel actions?

[V. Mutseniyeks] Interfront does not have any foundation under itself and it cannot even explain the purpose of its existence. I think that purification structures can be built in Riga even without Interfront sponsorship...

[Question] Apart from the members of the fronts, there exists a large group of people—let's call them arbitrarily "Latvian residents" [latviytsy]—who represent the non-indigenous nationality, but who were born and educated in Latvia and who are close to the spirit and culture of the Latvian nation. Alas, it has become fashionable today to appeal, for example, to a 16-year-old Rigan (whose internal passport identifies him as a Ukrainian or Belorussian) to "remember that his homeland is the Ukraine (or Belorussia," although he not only was not born there, but also has never been there even once. For a number of reasons, the "Latvian residents" have not joined the LPF, and that also applies to Interfront. They carry in their heart a deep grudge against those who are trying to divide them on the basis of nationality, or, even

worse, who call them "people without a Motherland" and "occupying forces." Thus, many people remain outside the active struggle for perestroika in the republic, since they do not see their place in any of the organizations that have been created. Your program also has been aimed at "awakening" only the Latvian nation. Don't you feel that you have made a mistake by not being concerned about the moods, hopes, and grudges specifically of these people, these "Latvian residents"?

[U. Neybergs] I specifically addressed that question at the previous meeting of the political section of the LNIM. The LPF actually did make a serious psychological mistake by leaving the "Latvian residents" outside the struggle. But why can't they try to get closer to us? Because the "Latvian residents," like the Latvians, have lived under the very same conditions as the Latvians, and we are fighting for a better Latvia where they too will live better. And it is best to fight under a national flag, without infringing at such time upon the interests of any nation.

At the present time many people use the words "occupying forces" and "occupation." But let's be just. Who are the "occupying forces"? Those who came into Latvia and who are living here? No, the republic was occupied by the Stalinist system. Everyone—and this includes us and it includes you—are victims of Stalinist policy, and it is not possible to remake history. We recommend thinking about and resolving the problems realistically, proceeding from the position as of today. And, of course, under the national flag of Latvia.

[Question] What do you understand by the term "political independence"?

[V. Mutseniyeks] Independence in making decisions locally.

[Question] What does that require? Because, after all, you do have your own republic Constitution...

[V. Mutseniyeks] ...in which it is stated that Latvia is an independent state and that we have all rights, up to and including the right to secede from the Soviet Union. Will we secede? No, if it will be a union of sovereign states. However, everything was well written in the text of the Constitution, but actually, for some reason, things are not turning out that way.

It is frightening for us to depend upon who happens at a particular moment to be at the helm of power in the USSR. It is a good thing that that person currently is Gorbachev, but where are the guarantees that there won't be another Stalin or Brezhnev? Economically we are very closely tied to the USSR, and the breaking of those ties would be equivalent to catastrophe. But we want to have legal guarantees that, with anyone in power, we will remain the masters in Latvia.

And that is precisely why we insist on the fact of recognizing the occupation in 1940. In that instance everything that occurred then automatically becomes illegal, and we obtain the right to demand our complete independence, up to and including our withdrawal from the Soviet Union (although formally, from the point of world public opinion, we never even entered it). The annexation of Latvia to the USSR was recognized at that time only by Sweden and New Zealand. Many governments still consider us to be an occupied territory.

[U. Neybergs] And what is especially unpleasant is the fact that that was an "occupation on the basis of an understanding" between the USSR and Germany. Incidentally, one of the reasons for this was the aggravation of the interethnic relations. You can imagine how a Latvian must have felt to learn suddenly that his nation had been sold as a result of a deal between two totalitarian regimes. An outburst of emotions was inevitable. And those emotions have come crashing down, not upon the Russians, but upon the system that made such an act possible.

I understood that Gorbachev's policy would bring benefits when he said that the thing that must be in first place is the human factor, a person's intellect. We can purchase the most up-to-date equipment, but without intellectual development we shall remain in the same place, if we do not raise our culture (including the culture of human relations). This a very important task today.

And there is something else: it is vitally important to introduce healthy competition into the apparatus of power. If one and the same party continues always to be at the head of the country in the future, there are no guarantees that the nightmares of the past will not be repeated. We need an alternative party, not fronts! And we need professional politicians. If, instead of legal specialists and economists, the government has lathe operators and milkmaids, the quality of administration will not change much—that's what I think about the current election.

[Question] Does the LNIM intend to claim a basis for creating this kind of party?

[V. Mutseniyeks] We have no claim to the status of a party—our movement unites too many different kinds of people. Our purpose is to lead people to the idea that a multiparty system is needed.

[Question] And then to create one of the parties on the basis of LNIM?

[V. Mutseniyeks] Yes. I think that that is completely natural and must occur.

[Question] How soon?

[V. Mutseniyeks] I am an optimist, and I feel that perestroyka, despite all the obstacles, will continue. But in general I do not like to engage in forecasting. I recall that a certain individual already promised to build communism by the year 1980... There is no alternative to perestroyka. But in order for perestroyka to move ahead, it is necessary to give independence to the republics, and to allow everything to be decided locally. This prospect frightens some people, and it inspires others, but the process itself, in my opinion, is inevitable.

[Question] In the middle of February (Authors' note: according to latest information, on 18 February) you are planning to conduct a movement congress. What slogan will it be conducted under?

[U. Neybergs] Just one slogan—the rebirth of the nation.

[V. Mutseniyeks] The preparation for the congress has given us a lot of problems to work out. For a long time we were unable to find a suitable place—none was offered to us, even though we appealed to almost all the rayon centers where suitable places are available. And at the House of Political Enlightenment, where it has already become traditional to carry out constituent measures, we were told that we would first have to submit all the documents that would be discussed at the congress.

The fact of the matter is that, for the time being, we do not have anything to submit. Our program is still only in the draft form, and, of course, it will be amended and reworked. Considerable changes and additions will also be made to the LNIM charter.

[Question] But what about the draft of the movement's program that appears at the LNIM display?

[V. Mutseniyeks] In our movement the basic principle is the pluralism of opinions. We do not even have a leader as such. But this superdemocracy sometimes even is a hindrance, as in the case of this draft of the program. The draft was not discussed and was not accepted at a council. Actually, it is the product of one person's activity, with a number of moot and unacceptable positions and formulations that many participants in the movement, including myself, do not agree with. To a certain extent, the program that appeared at the display might have compromised the ideas of the movement.

[Question] Inasmuch as you do not have any leadership, it would be interesting to learn the structure of administration of the movement and what your status in it is.

[V. Mutseniyeks] The movement is administered by the council. I am one of its 12 members.

[U. Neybergs] I am a member of the movement's political section. In addition to our section, the movement has a cultural section, an economic section, and a section

for questions of religion. In addition, within the political section there has been created a group that engages in the development of documents and the preparation of the constituent congress.

[Question] May we hope that the documents prepared by the movement will be submitted to the press?

[V. Mutseniyeks] Of course. We do not have any secrets from anyone. We want very much to be understood correctly...

[U. Neybergs] With all my heart I hope that this interview will serve as the beginning of mutual understanding and unification for everyone who wants to make our—and I emphasize, our—Latvia better. By learning to understand our pain, you will also be able to understand your own...

The persons on duty in Room 1108 were Sergey Malakhovskiy and Yevgeniy Orlov.

P.S. We request the readers of SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH to send to the editorial office, with the notation "LNIM Congress," any questions that have arisen after reading this item. Uldis and Visvaldis have promised to convey your ideas, wishes, and arguments to the organizing committee of the LNIM Congress.

Latvian Popular Front's Reaction to Press Coverage of Latvian Emigre Meeting Noted

18000440 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 17 Dec 88 p 3

[Unsigned article under the rubric "Rejoinder": "Who Is This Meant For?"]

[Text] The ether became clear: the jamming of foreign radio stations' programs, which are broadcast in the languages of the peoples inhabiting our country, has stopped. This even includes the programs for the residents of the Latvian SSR. These broadcasts are being listened to. The time has passed when it was thought that "voices" of every sort would certainly undermine the moral, ideological, and patriotic principles of the Soviet people. Now experience itself confirms: people who listen to these programs are able to distinguish for themselves between the truth and propagandistic rubbish—even in the programs of those radio stations, which are suspected of being not particularly sympathetic to the socialist system.

And it was no surprise to SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, when the editorial office began to receive telephone calls. The readers were interested in the facts, which were heard on the Voice of America broadcast in Latvian, concerning the OLA conference abroad. There were many phone calls. Over a period of several days. It turned out that more than a few of the republic's "Russian-speaking" residents were familiar with the

Voice of America broadcasts for the indigenous population of Latvija. And when the newspaper CINA published the text of one of the Voice of America broadcasts and accompanied it with several questions, our newspaper, at the request of our readers, reprinted the aforementioned article yesterday. On the very same day, an "Open Letter" from the governing body of the Popular Front of Latvija was published in the newspaper PADOMJU JAUNATNE and the "Labvakar" programs in the newspaper CINA.

And yesterday once again the telephones in the editorial office began to ring. Calls came in from Riga, Yelgava, Yurmala, Ogre, and other cities in the republic. Some readers expressed their opinion regarding the Voice of America broadcast and others—in connection with the "Open Letter". One of the more typical statements follows. Ya. Ankuzis, a resident of Riga, (incidentally, one of those who requested that we reprint the CINA article) advanced the following opinion:

—The authors of the "Open Letter", as is readily apparent in every paragraph of the letter, were outraged by the appearance of the text from the Voice of America program in CINA. I agree that the Popular Front of Latvija (NFL) cannot "assume responsibility for the portrayal of the course of the OLA conference in the Voice of America broadcast. But in the letter, where the hint is dropped that the broadcast was in error, there is not even a hint of disproof of the facts, which were broadcasted. The fact that members of the NFL Duma appeared at the conference and spoke from its rostrum has also not been denied.

If dialogue is what it is to be, then let it be dialogue. But in this case, where the authors of the "Open Letter" perceived a tendentiousness in the presentation "of information concerning the visit by S. Kalinete and Eh. Inkensa, members of the NFL Duma, as guests of the OLA conference"? They cite the publishing of a commentary without a signature. However, there is a signature: "Radio listeners". It appears that many people responded and it was hardly expedient to list all of them. Furthermore, as the experience of the mass media in all countries has shown, any articles can be signed with initials only and even pass without a signature.

The fact that in the "Open Letter", the Popular Front's governing body "categorically rejects the accusations and attacks against the NFL, which were set forth in the newspaper CINA, as well as the accusatory tone of the commentary cause bewilderment...". But the commentary belongs to the Voice of America. As far as CINA is concerned, radio listeners merely raised a number of questions on its pages. And they expressed a desire to hear the answers to them. This is quite natural if people have doubts. After all, even the Popular Front very frequently addresses questions to the most diverse instances.

In the "Open Letter", except for the "indignation" directed toward CINA, there is not an answer to a single one of the questions, which was asked. In this case, it

probably would have been more logical for the Voice of America to state the claims and not the newspaper CINA.

Lithuanian 'National' Sports Team Proposed 18000645

[Editorial Report] Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian on 14 February 1989 carries on page 4 a 400-word letter-to-editor from I. Shvets proposing that Lithuanian athletes participating in the Olympics and other international sports events appear under the Lithuanian national flag. He states that "Lithuania as a sovereign republic should appear under its own flag in international sports movements and I would like my proposal to be included in the Lithuanian Constitution."

Editorial commentary following the letter notes that the Lithuanian National Olympic Committee (LNOC) must first become a member of the International Olympic Committee before Lithuanian athletes appear under their own flag in Olympic games.

Statistics on Nationality Groups, Language Use in Ukraine

18300317 Kiev KOMMUNIST UKRAINY in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 pp 64-65

[Editorial response under the "You Ask, We Answer" rubric: "The People of the Ukraine: Who are We? How Many of Us Are There?"]

In connection with preparations for the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on questions of international relations, it would be interesting to find out what the Ukrainian nation consists of, how the nationalities are represented in the socio-political structure and in the areas of science and culture in the republic, and how their spiritual needs and wants are provided for.

[Signed] N.P. Ovcharenko, Kherson

At present, about 52 million people live in the Ukraine, representing more than 100 nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union. In terms of national make-up, they are distributed as follows (according to the 1979 census, in percentages):

Ukrainians	73.6
Russians	21.1
Jews	1.3
Belorussians	0.8
Moldavians	0.6
Poles	0.5
Bulgarians	0.5
Hungarians	0.3
Rumanians	0.2
Greeks	0.2
Tatars	0.2(CrimeanTatars werenotlisted separately)
Others	0.7

On the whole the proportion of non-indigenous nationalities in the republic amounts to 26.4 percent (according to the 1979 census).

The Ukrainian Communist Party combines in its ranks representatives of 106 of the country's nations and nationalities: Ukrainians account for 67 percent; Russians, 27.3, and representatives of other nationalities, 5.7 percent.

Elected to local Soviets of People's Deputies are representatives of 74 nations and nationalities of the USSR: Ukrainians amount to 85.2 percent; Russians, 11.3, and representatives of other nationalities, 3.5 percent.

Operating in the Ukraine are 20,500 general-educational day schools (with 6.8 million pupils). In terms of language of instruction they comprise:

Ukrainian	15.3thousand
Russian	4.6thousand
Moldavian	111
Hungarian	50
Polish	2

In 1988 more than 200 additional schools with instruction in the Ukrainian language were opened; in many cities there are parallel classes and groups in preschool institutions, instruction and training in which are accomplished in the Ukrainian and Russian languages.

Changes have been introduced to the academic plans. The study of the Ukrainian language and literature has been increased by 5 hours in schools with Ukrainian-language instruction, and by 2 hours where Russian is the language of instruction. The study of the Ukrainian and Russian languages has been introduced in the 9th and 10th grades.

For the study of the Bulgarian, Crimean Tatar, Modern Greek, Moldavian, Hungarian, Polish and Gagauz languages, 451 optional groups have been set up.

Out of 22,800 pre-school institutions, education is conducted in the Ukrainian language in 13,300.

More than 1,700 newspapers and 107 magazines and magazine-type publications are published in the republic; of these nearly 1,500 and 51, respectively, are published in Ukrainian.

Eleven newspapers are published in the Hungarian and Moldavian languages. A literary-artistic supplement to the oblast newspaper KARPATI IGAZ SO (Uzhgorod) has begun to be published in the Hungarian language, and five rayon newspapers in Odessa Oblast publish pages in the Bulgarian language.

The proportion of internal broadcasts in the Ukrainian language by republic radio and television studios amounts to 86 and 52 percent, respectively; in local

broadcasts, 76.2 and 51.1 percent. Local radio and television broadcasting are also carried out in the Moldavian and Hungarian languages.

In 1987 34.8 percent of the literary titles were published in the Ukrainian language (44.3 percent in terms of circulation); 60.7 percent (54.4) were published in Russian; and 4.5 percent (1.3) in other languages. Including works of fiction, the figures are 65.5 percent (44.1), 30 percent (54.8) and 4.5 percent (1.1) respectively.

To satisfy the needs of the population of non-indigenous nationalities, a Crimean Tatar-Russian Dictionary, Bulgarian-Ukrainian Dictionary, and Czech-Ukrainian Dictionary have been published.

"Suzirya," a store for literature of the fraternal nations of the USSR, has been opened in Kiev; meanwhile book stores in the oblast centers have departments for publications in the languages of a number of non-indigenous nationalities.

COPYRIGHT: IZDATELSTVO "RADYANSKA UKRAINA" "KOMMUNIST UKRAINY" 1989.

Working Group Formed on State Status for Ukrainian Language

18000657 Kiev *PRAVDA UKRAINY* in Russian
8 Feb 89 p 3

[RATAU report: "Working Group Formed"]

[Text] The UkSSR Supreme Soviet Permanent Commissions on Questions of Patriotic and International Education and International Relations, Education and Culture, and Legislative Initiatives have formed a working group for the preparation of a supplemental draft to the UkSSR Constitution giving the Ukrainian language state status, as well as for the UkSSR draft law on free development and equality in the use of Ukrainian and other languages of the peoples of the USSR.

The working group's fundamental direction and agenda were determined at the 7 February 1989 organizational meeting.

A report of the working group's session will be published.

Reader Blasts UkSSR Minister of Trade for Consumer Shortages

18110046a Kiev *MOLOD UKRAYINY* in Ukrainian
7 Jan 89 p 2

[Open letter from Viktor Khrapachevskyy to the UkSSR Minister of Trade, published under the rubric "Questions for the Minister of Trade": "Take a Little Stroll With Us!"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Minister of Trade!

Allow me to ask you a question: Do you visit the stores often? Or let me rephrase the question: Do you tour your domain very often, at least in Kiev? Even once a month? I shall answer for you: No. Because if you were to take a glance into the stores you would immediately see what a disgrace they are. You most probably have not come into direct contact with them, and therefore you would probably not believe how bad things are. (Of course we are far from going hungry, but....) In your domain the word "shortage" has become as common as the greeting "good morning." I am not about to enumerate all items which have disappeared from store shelves, because that would take up too much time. I would merely ask: Where has the candy disappeared to? In the stores they tell us that candy is also being used for making moonshine vodka. We adults perhaps can understand that, although not all of us. But what are we supposed to tell the children?

Perhaps you can tell us what to say. I have a suggestion. In order to stop tormenting the consuming public with shortages, which are sprouting up daily like mushrooms after a rain, why don't you, esteemed comrade minister, publish in the newspaper a list of items which will be in short supply during the coming month. Then the consuming public will be prepared in advance....

Today a workforce is paid in conformity with the end result. But I wonder on what basis you are paid? I shall be waiting for your reply to appear in the newspaper MOLOD UKRAYINY.

Respectfully yours,

*Viktor Khrapachevskyy, resident of the town of Boyarka,
near Kiev.*

Ukrainian Reader Questions Export of Fuel Oil
18110046b Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 7 Jan 89 p 2

[Letter from reader V. Kishko, Vynnyky, Lvov Oblast, published under the rubric "Voice From Line," : "Once Again About Fuel"]

[Text] Lines, lines.... For soap, pantyhose, sausage, and vodka. They have reached such magnitude that they have been noticed not only by those who spend a good part of their time in lines but also by those who do not. And although the situation has not changed very much because of this, nevertheless decisions are being made on how to supply working people with soap and pantyhose. But they do not even make any promises to those who stand in gasoline lines.

In foreign films I see people driving private cars. That means that they have gasoline. Where do they get it? And yet we sell oil abroad, although we ourselves have no fuel.... Is this the right thing to be doing?

V. Kishko, Vynnyky, Lvov Oblast.

Reader Charges Officials Arbitrarily Apply Law Against 'Meetings'

18110046c Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 7 Jan 89 p 2

[Letter from reader I. Kovalchuk, Khmelnytskyi Oblast, published under the rubric "Waiting for an Answer," : "I Am Not a Law Expert, But...."]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Potebenko!

You replied to questions by a RADYANSKA UKRAYINA reporter. Your responses appear in RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, No 281, in an article entitled "Freedom of Assembly and Rule of Law." It is difficult for those who are not legal professionals to understand the difference between a mass meeting [mityng] and, as you state in your reply, a so-called mass meeting [tak zvanyy mityng]. Apparently the definition is as follows. A mass meeting is when the executive committee permits it, while a so-called mass meeting is one which the executive committee is empowered to prohibit. Thus it seems that if the agenda of this mass meeting contains positive comments about the executive committee, then this mass meeting will not cause any harm.

But if the agenda contains an item which will cause the bureaucrat in authority to become embarrassed before the people, then he will certainly proclaim it to be a so-called mass meeting. If he is unable to accomplish his objective with words, he has the court and other punitive agencies at his disposal. As I, who am not a specialist in the law, see it, that which is not permitted should be prohibited by law. Consequently, that which is not prohibited should be permitted. Otherwise the decision will be in the hands of a local administrative official.

I. Kovalchuk, Khmelnytska Oblast

Official Findings on Chernovtsy Illness Fail To Appease Residents

18000357 Kiev RABOCHAYA GAZETA in Russian
29 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by V. Pelekh, RATAU Correspondent, V. Nazarchuk, RABOCHAYA GAZETA Correspondent, and R. Shostak: "Restless Days in Chernovtsy"]

[Text] Drastic steps in improving the ecological environment and implementing preventive measures in Chernovtsy have led to a sharp decline in the incidence of illness among the children, but over the last few days, the situation, nevertheless, has become complicated due to other reasons.

Despite the government commission's unbiased data and findings concerning the causes of the illness and the ways to overcome it once and for all, which are regularly published in the local press and actively broadcasted over radio and television, unfounded rumors have spread throughout the city. Conjecture was being spread

by irresponsible individuals that the illness had become massive, that it is affecting not only children, but adults as well, and the condition of those who are undergoing medical treatment is deteriorating.

The insufficiently considered supplementary assortment of foodstuffs, which was being provided to the children as a high-calorie diet, added fuel to the fire. Long lines formed at the stores which were serving them. Moreover, canned foods with long shelf life appeared on the counters.

In the situation which has arisen many people came to the central city square last Friday in order to meet with the representatives of the local authorities, to state their claims and desires, and to receive firsthand information. Such a yearning on the part of the townspeople is completely natural. But demagogues and instigators wormed their way into the group of people who were truly worried about the health of their children. They recited provocative slogans and insulted those who were trying to calm the enraged thugs down.

Members of the medical commission, which was engaged in ascertaining the origin of the illness, was developing preventive measures and methods of treating it, and is currently continuing to monitor the situation, were urgently invited to the city by the government commission.

A. A. Baranov, the USSR Deputy Minister of Health, A. I. Kondrusev, the Chief State Sanitation Inspector, and G. A. Samsygina and A. G. Rumyantsev, the Chief Pediatrician and Chief Hematologist from the USSR Ministry of Health, arrived in Chernovtsy on the following day. They appeared on a television press conference, the conducting of which was made known to the population in advance. Alluding to the information gained through the research at major scientific centers in our country and abroad, it was reaffirmed that the insidious illness, which broke out in the city, is linked to thallium combined with other heavy metals, which get into the children's organisms by means of aerosol sprays.

While answering numerous questions, the specialists, with full responsibility, emphasized: the observance of subsequent preventive measures will inevitably lead to a taming of the illness, which has already begun to subside and does not pose a threat to either children or adults. Data concerning the course of the illness and the results of soil analyses were forwarded to the world's major scientific centers of UNESCO and UNICEF. The foreign specialists' findings regarding the causes of the disease and the methods of treating it coincide completely with the conclusions of the Soviet physicians. Thus, there is no need to invite foreign specialists to Chernovtsy (the participants in the demonstration suggested such a need might exist).

The people were once again informed in detail concerning the work which is being done to improve the ecological situation in the city. Fourteen factories, workshops, and sectors, which were unfavorable in an ecological sense, have been closed down there. By a resolution of the Party obkom buro, those who are guilty of polluting the city and discharging harmful substances are being held strictly accountable by the Party. The sources of the pollution are being pinpointed. In the opinion of the commission and other specialists, one of the sources was automobiles, whose owners are using chemical substances as antiknock compounds. The specialists, who treated children at clinics in Moscow and Kiev and who were recruited by the city, reported that the condition of the sick children is not a cause for any apprehension whatever and that the absolute majority of them, for all practical purposes, are healthy and have been sent to the "Ukraina" sanatorium near Kiev for further observation by doctors. Definitive answers were given to the citizens' disturbing questions, which were called into the studio via a direct telephone line.

While the press conference was being held, a crowd once again gathered in front of the building of the City Soviet of People's Deputies. It demanded a meeting with the specialists from the capital. But when the specialists appeared on an improvised platform, an uproar was once again raised. Under these circumstances it was impossible to hear either the questions of the crowd or the answers. As a result the meeting was postponed until Sunday. It will be held in one of the most spacious halls in the city.

At that time the enraged thugs, many of whom showed up at the square in a drunken state, transcended all admissible bounds of behavior in public places. They insulted those who were present, broke several windows in the city ispolkom building, and injured two militiamen. And only the tenacity and equanimity, which was displayed by the officials from the internal affairs agencies, prevented an incident with unpredictable consequences.

Thanks to the steps which were taken, the situation in the city returned to normal on Sunday. After receiving an additional amount of information, the people who had a personal interest dispersed to their homes and those who were hiding behind them and speaking out in their name did not dare to continue the disorder.

V. G. Istratiy, an arc welder at the F. Eh. Dzerzhinskiy Machine Building Plant in Chernovtsy, stated,—I am deeply troubled by the actions of the elements who behaved like hooligans and, as a father, I am worried about my children's fate, but no one is allowed to express their attitudes in this manner. Democracy is not anarchy and one must be held accountable before the law for illegal deeds and actions. I hope that the guilty parties are exposed and punished.

Many residents of the city, with whom we had an opportunity to speak during these restless days, share and support the worker's opinion.

V. Pelekh, Correspondent RATAU.

Despite all the efforts of the Emergency Government Commission and the massive spontaneous removal of children from the city (today, according to the commission's data, there are 570 children, or less than 4 percent in four nursery schools, which have been converted to round-the-clock operations in a sanatorium regimen; 11,056 children, or 33 percent are attending secondary educational institutions), there are new cases of the illness. Currently the number of new cases has been fixed at 133. The situation in the city is tense, as has been recounted above.

A Party obkom meeting took place, which examined the issue of the sick children in Chernovtsy. It imposed severe Party punishment on P. M. Kaspruk, the chairman of the city ispolksom, V. P. Protsenko, the chief physician at the oblast medical epidemiological station, and M. F. Zhulyev, the chief of the oblast housing administration. Party punishment was also imposed on other senior officials, who were to blame for the situation which arose.

What does the situation look like today? The assessments of the specialists from the USSR Ministry of Health and from the Emergency Government Commission are in agreement. They feel that the situation is stabilizing and the level of thallium in the city is decreasing. New cases of the illness are natural since there is an incubation period of two weeks to 50 days. Even among the children who have been taken away from the city there are seven cases. As far as a lethal outcome is concerned, one child actually did die, but from a congenital heart disease.

USSR Ministry of Health specialists, who arrived from Moscow yesterday, met with people in the work collectives, gave talks, and answered questions. Little by little passions are subsiding. But the situation will not become completely normal until evidence is produced concerning the source of the pollution.

V. Nazarchuk, Correspondent RABOCHAYA GAZETA

R. Shostak, Chernovtsy

Progress in Liquidating Chernobyl's Aftermath in BSSR Examined

*18000578a Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
22, 23 Feb 89*

[Article by A. Gulyayev, SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent, Belorussian SSR: "In the 'Zone' and Around It"]

[22 Feb 89 p 3]

[Text] In late January the CPSU Central Committee Politburo considered the question of the rate of the

operations being carried out in the rayons of Belorussia to eliminate the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES. The resolution that was adopted mentioned the need to take more active steps improve the situation in the zone that had suffered, and to allocated additional financial and material resources for that purpose. All these measures were needed largely because, until now, the operations that have been planned here are being carried out more slowly than the situation requires.

"Arguments in a train are the limit, and nothing will come of them..." are the words in a currently fashionable song. To a certain degree this conclusion can be extended to a large number of discussions, especially if their participants know or hope that the consequences of the opinions expressed do not concern them personally.

One may take as an example a problem that nowadays has been somewhat forgotten behind the other events—the problem of the territories that suffered as a result of the Chernobyl accident. In Belorussia this is approximately one-fifth of the republic, and 171,000 persons there were subjected to the effect of radiation, one-fourth of whom were children. And not only "were subjected to," but also they continue to be subjected to that effect, inasmuch as all these people continue to live, work, and go to school in the so-called "strict monitoring" zone.

Quite recently one used to hear the most varied recommendations concerning the state of their health. In the previous articles on this topic that were published in April 1988 under the overall title "People in the Zone," our newspaper listed the most alarming forecasts. It was assumed, for example, that there would be an increase in the number of cancer cases. Fortunately, medical statistics has now refuted that. There were strong fears concerning the health of newborn infants. Today, however, it can be said that the infant mortality rate—which, incidentally, is one of the lowest in the country—has remained at its previous level here. And even the black humor of a ditty that is popular in the "zone," to the effect that "a Zaporozhets is not a truck, and a **krasno-polets** is not a man" (Krasnopol'skiy Rayon is one of the rayons that suffered most from the radiation effect), continues not to reflect the potential possibilities for the male half of the population.

All this gives justification to many people, including the most competent ones, the scientists, to say that, if definite conditions are observed, there is no danger for the population. That is the view, for example, of L. A. Buldakov, deputy director of the Institute of Biophysics, USSR Minzdrav [Ministry of Health], corresponding member of AMN [Academy of Medical Sciences]. Another person who adheres to that point of view is A. P. Povolyayev, deputy chief of the Main Administration of Scientific-Research and Experimental Institutions, USSR Gosagroprom. Even if the dosage is increased, they are convinced, there will be no serious consequences.

As far as that dosage is concerned, it is felt that every individual can "pick up" during the course of his entire life, without any danger to his health, as many as 35 rems. But there are also other opinions. The magazine ZNANIYE—SILA (No 8, 1988) published an interview with D. M. Grodzinskiy, corresponding member of UkSSR Academy of Sciences. Grodzinskiy devotes special attention to the radiation of large masses of people: "...collective radiation is the total radiation of large populations. The fact of the matter is that a large number of injuries in the population have the nature of concealed recessive mutations. But when people marry, these mutations can change over to a homozygous state and reveal themselves, and in subsequent generations this can lead to various kinds of genetic breakdowns."

Putting it in simpler terms, he is discussing the remote consequences of the effect of small dosages—those same dosages that today are considered to be normal. It is, of course, possible to disagree with Grodzinskiy's views, but it would appear that one should not disregard this warning. It would certainly seem to be simply criminal to leave this question unconsidered until it comes up again later on, after the train in which these arguments are being waged has traveled so far that it can no longer return to the station from which it left.

In addition, Grodzinskiy has his adherents. For example, Doctor of Sciences E. I. Eborovskiy, an eminent Belorussian scientist, feels that it is possible right now to talk about the intermediated influence of the "zone" upon people's health. Leaving to the scientists their scientific arguments, it would seem that it would be proper to do everything to provide overinsurance, even by a factor of many times, against any misfortune, even the most improbable and most unimaginable.

We have already written about what must be done. It is necessary to remove the radioactivity in settlements and entire cities, to asphalt the roads and territories around schools, kindergartens, and animal farms, to lay many kilometers of water-supply pipes, and to provide gas service for the "zone." This will require equipment with sealed compartments that can protect the equipment operator from the effect of radioactive dust. An entire complex of hygienic measures is mandatory: shower rooms, equipment for washing the equipment, and laundries for washing work clothing that has been impregnated with that same radioactive dust. For the last two or three months before they are slaughtered, animals must be fed "clean" fodders. "Clean" fodders are also the guarantee of obtaining "clean" milk. According to the scientists' recommendations, the output of vegetable husbandry will be uncontaminated simply by adding an additional amount of mineral fertilizers, etc.

In a word, the efforts to eliminate the consequences of the accident can be summarized as the considerable increase in the volumes of construction, agrotechnical, and agroreclamation operations. Of course, resources are being allocated and the operations are being carried out.

But I would like to quote a recent resolution of the board of USSR Agroprom: "A matter of particular concern is the slow carrying out of measures to create the proper conditions for the population's labor activities and their residing on that territory, as well as to fulfill the necessary operations to reduce the rate at which radionuclides contaminate the output being produced."

One does not have to go far to find facts to confirm this conclusion. For example, take Gomel Oblast, the share of which was more than half the contaminated territory in Europe. The 1988 plan for asphaltting the streets has been fulfilled by only slightly more than half, and the plan for kindergartens and animal farms, by only 6.3 percent. Water-supply pipes, bath houses, stations for removing the radioactivity from equipment, shower rooms, laundries for washing work clothing, the providing of gas—in many instances these are only good intentions.

The amount of special equipment continues to be ridiculously small. As of last autumn, Narovlyanskiy Rayon, Gomel Oblast, a rayon that is entirely located in the strict monitoring zone, received a total of four tractors with sealed compartments. At rates such as it, the amount of time that will be required to provide safe conditions for all the equipment operators will be something like 100 years.

Approximately the same situation prevails in Mogilev Oblast. In this oblast, milk and meat containing radioactive substances continue to be shipped out of 11 rayons. In Gomel Oblast, it has been possible to reduce the receipts of this kind of meat to 1.7 percent, but the milk containing radionuclides constitutes almost one-fifth.

As a result, approximately one-third the population in the strict monitoring zone, according to information provided by USSR Gosagroprom, receives dosages in excess of the admissible ones. And if no decisive changes occur, they will be exceeded by a factor of 1.5-2. Then the only thing that will be left is to hope that that the radiation is not really that terrible.

Hope is something that people always have. One can continue to believe that everything will turn out well, just as people used to believe in the safety of nuclear power plants. And then one can believe that, even after an accident, it will be possible to go out calmly to a holiday celebration, or to take countryside strolls in the open air, which have already brought a terrible danger to tens of thousands of people. And then one can believe that it is harmful to tell people the whole truth, but beneficial to do everything to keep them in places that have been populated for many, many years. Except, obviously, the 30-kilometer zone.

In that same Krasnopol'skiy Rayon, I managed to have a conversation with a kolkhoz chairman. He was a very even-tempered and painstaking kind of person, and he

proudly told me that practically no one had left his farm, where, incidentally, the radiation situation continues to this very day to be among the most complicated ones.

"We carried out this work with the party organizer..."

"But are you convinced that this work of yours is in everyone's best interests? Could it be that all of them should have told that they should leave the farm immediately, and that keeping them here is, essentially speaking, a crime?"

You cannot imagine the effect that that question had on that honest individual, who, at a difficult moment, had demonstrated so much personal bravery! Because that idea had never even entered his mind. He was told to keep the people from panicking—and that is what he had done. But whether that was good or bad, how was he supposed to know? Even the specialists were confused. Only two years ago the maximum radiation dosage had been set at 70 rems for a person's entire lifetime, then it was changed to 50, and now it is 35.

It is not surprising that people have already begun to lose much of their faith and have become tired of waiting for the promised changes. For example, the workers at the Znamya Sovkhov, Cherkovskiy Rayon, Mogilev Oblast, who we mentioned in previous reports. After the statement in the newspaper, the construction of a settlement for them in the "clean" zone was sort-of begun, and it was even proposed that, by the end of last year, it would be handed over for operation. But the months have been going by, and things are not yet moving. But the doctors keep driving in to make inspections, and the radiologists keep making their measurements, and then, without reporting the results, everyone goes back where they came from. "They're experimenting on us!" is the conviction that people are getting.

But they are incapable of changing anything. Because nothing depends on them. And those upon whom they depend, do not live in the zone.

[23 Feb 89 p 5]

[Text] As a rule, many of those upon whom the resolution of the "zone's" problems depend do not live there. Could that explain why the attitude to those problems is different at various levels? I recall a conversation with M. A. Gurinovich, the secretary of a republic commission to eliminate the consequences of the accident. Learning that the author of these lines had information concerning the slow rate of progress in the operations, the first thing he did was to attempt to find out from whom that information had been obtained. Because everything was proceeding normally. So who was causing dissension?

We have already had the opportunity to point out that everything was by no means normal. Here are two more examples. The cesium content in the milk obtained from

personally owned cows is higher by a factor of 2-2.5 than in the socially owned herd. And that is only because no one has been dealing properly with the question of assigning "clean" pastures. The cows nibble at the grass where they always have, and people also drink milk just as they always have. Because people can get used to anything. In the final analysis, you simply get tired of thinking about an unknown danger, when nothing explodes, no one does any shooting, and no one murders anyone.

Well, then, is it really so difficult to set aside "clean" pastures and to convince people of the danger of drinking "dirty" milk? It is just as necessary to do this as it is to work seriously with those who have accumulated an increased dosage. But here is the testimony of V. A. Matyukin, academician at USSR AMN [Academy of Medical Sciences], who recently took over the management of the recently created NII [Scientific-Research Institute] of Radiation Medicine [I am quoting an excerpt of an interview that Vladimir Aleksandrovich gave to the republic newspaper ZVYAZDA]: "I was completely upset by the indifference toward those who had been shown to have an increased quantity of radionuclides in the organism. In our opinion, the optimal chain in working with the human being in this instance must be: measuring the quantity of radionuclides in the organism; if that figure is large, urgent analysis; then preventive measures, the creation of correct working and rest conditions for the person, and, if necessary, the providing of medical treatment for him. Unfortunately, today that chain is broken in the middle. For example, during an inspection it was established that the level of radionuclides in the organism has been increased. People record that information in a log, but no one does any further work with the person."

That interview took place about a half-year ago. But even now, when one is in the "zone," one is convinced that not much has changed. People in the republic have not been able to achieve a breakthrough. Just as they have been unable to overcome the departmental confusion, or to send funds and resources to the proper destination. Because difficulties with deliveries have been added onto the local problems already existing. In order to obtain pure output of animal husbandry in the strict monitoring zone, the republic requested 481,000 tons of combined fodders. But the republic was allocated only 119,500 tons. Then an alternative recommendation was made from Belorussia: remove from Mogilev and Gomel oblasts the plans for grain shipments—as a result that would constitute practically the same quantity of combined fodders and would preclude any countershipments. But there has not yet been any decision, inasmuch as the center has not yet become accustomed to anything at all. Gomel Oblast, which lost, in the settlement zone, an entire agricultural rayon—20 kolkhozes—has not had a reduction in state shipments of even a kilogram of meat or a quintal of grain.

Nor is it any simpler to resolve the questions of additional financing, of allocating material resources. A very

authoritative commission spent a long time studying the reliability of the republic's requests, in order—God forbid!—not to allocate anything extra to those who had suffered. As a result, a decision was born, to allocate an additional sum of more than 100 million rubles. People did not even have time to rejoice, before it was learned that only half of them had been supported by material resources.

Sly, but not completely, or even entirely, unfulfilled decisions always were popular in the practical life of the bureaucratic apparatus. I had to get in touch with many subdivisions of USSR Gosagromprom, whose shoulders bear the lion's share of the operations to eliminate the consequences of the accident. For example, the administration for supplying the operations with metal, pipes, tools, protective clothing, and farm and other production commodities. This is a question I asked deputy chief P. V. Moldavan:

"In 1988, Gomel Oblast alone had an underallotment of 100 tons of petroleum-pipeline pipes, 120 tons of polyethylene pipes, and 250 tons of rolled metal. How can one explain this?"

"We give the republic everything that it is supposed to receive on the basis of the funds. We do not have a special account for Chernobyl."

Nor does the administration for the shipment of building materials have a separate account. Its chief, I. Kh. Yafarov, explains:

"In principle, of course, it could exist. There has been a practice of allocating 'red-line' materials, in especially important situations. But that question was not raised here, and the materials are being allocated to the republic as a whole. For 1989, their allocation is 9 percent more."

"Do you mean that that 9 percent will cover the republic's needs? Couldn't it be that the amount needed will be 19 or 29?"

"I can't tell you."

The farther we went, the clearer it became that those very materials would not be delivered completely. During the present year it is assumed that there will be a shortage of bricks. Consequently, everyone, including the "zone," will receive fewer bricks. Approximately 70 percent of the need for slate will be covered. But no consideration is taken of the fact that during the process of removing the radioactivity, it will be necessary to replace thousands of roofs that have been saturated with radionuclides.

The next person with whom we spoke, Yu. V. Pankov, chief of the administration for supply of motor-tractor equipment, said, "Three times we considered the question of creating special equipment, including at the level of USSR Gosplan. Decisions were made. Finally, that

equipment began to be produced. But, first of all, there is not enough of it. Secondly, the filters get clogged with radioactive dust and they themselves become sources of radiation. And as for air conditioners, which could create excess pressure in the compartment and push the dust out, we do not have any."

Nothing has changed! Everything is being decided the way it always used to be decided, dozens of years ago. The crux of the question, like water poured on the sand, continues to go somewhere, leaving on the surface a pale residue of minutes, decisions, and orders that do not lead to anything.

Why is it that there still aren't any individual radiation meters for the population? Because the people themselves could determine the danger and could take the proper steps to avoid the accumulation of those extra rems, damn them! If a light turns on, don't touch that mushroom! Don't buy that chicken! If you can see it, there is less danger.

Ye. I. Ignatenko, chief of the main scientific-technical administration of USSR Minatomenergo [Ministry of Atomic Power], agrees that the radiation meters are needed.

"But the enterprises did not want to undertake the production of them. After all, we have cost accountability now."

Nevertheless, it is probably not cost accountability that is to blame for the fact that today, almost three years after the accident, there are no simple or reliable instruments for the population. During one of my discussions at Gosagromprom, I heard the following idea expressed:

"Nobody needs radiation meters. They only cause panic. We ourselves will explain to people where they should or should not be."

There it is, that stereotype of bureaucratic thinking: "we ourselves"! And if something isn't quite right, then the ones who will analyze the situation are those bureaucrats themselves—no problem!... By virtue of this circumstance there still is no press service which could answer in a simple, easily understood manner to the large number of questions that have accumulated in the "zone." Bits and pieces of information continue to trickle down into the press not thanks to, but despite, the efforts of the officials.

The neglected state of the situation manifested itself clearly at a recent press conference which the republic commission for the elimination of the consequences of the accident finally held in Minsk. People expected a lot from that press conference, but, unfortunately, there was no worthwhile discussion. Everything boiled down to altercations among the representatives of the public and the authorities. Some of the commission members were indignant later: what are we supposed to be—people's

enemies? No, of course, that is not the crux of the matter. It is simply that a worker in the most representative apparatus is incapable of objectively sensing another person's pain. He has a large number of problems, and other priorities, and, in the final analysis, limited opportunities. That is why it is so important for everyone to be able to determine for himself the degree of danger! So that everyone can decide for himself whether or not he should live here, whether or not he should invest his funds here. It is not precluded that the time will come when someone will compute how many personal files were reviewed during these years, and how many party cards were taken back from people who demonstrated firmness in expressing a normal desire—the desire to guarantee safety for their own children, who, in turn, will want to live and give birth to their children.

Without a doubt, this is a topic for the future. But for the time being... People in the "zone" hope that they will see the results of the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, that was recently passed with regard to this question. One must think that the money and the material resources will show up. But how many of them—the people above the "zone"—are able to bury any decision! In addition, too many of them perceive any attempt to introduce into any matter under their jurisdiction even the slightest element of glasnost as an encroachment upon their authority. So, once again, they keep saying, "We ourselves..." And once again they remain silent, once again they attempt "not to create panic," subjecting to danger the life and health of many people.

Therefore it will certainly be reasonable to ask the question: isn't it time for the republic government to give a report to those who are living in the "zone"? To answer the questions: what funds were allocated, and where where they expended? Why did the republic assume the entire burden of operations that it now is incapable of coping with, and who made that decision? Why, under the conditions of a critical shortage of manpower and funds, are tens of millions of rubles of capital investments that are reinforced by material and labor resources being used outside the confines of the republic? And shouldn't we create a nondepartmental commission made up of representatives of the public, which commission could monitor the resolution of all the "zone's" problems?

We are faced by a large number of questions today. The answers to them will be difficult. But it is only if they can be heard clearly—the direct and harsh questions, and the frank and honest answers—that we can count on not having to locate the guilty individuals ten to fifteen years from now, on not having to repent belatedly, on not having to make new, useless decisions.

Open House Tours for Public Begin at Rovno AES

18000578b Kiev *RABOCHAYA GAZETA* in Russian
19 Jan 89 p 3

[Article by I. Pashchuk: "Visit the AES!"]

[Text] On 17 January there was an open house at the Rovno AES imeni 60-Letiye SSSR.

Representatives of the public, and everyone who wanted to, visited the engine and reactor rooms of the operating power units, the central control panel, the training center, and other areas at the AES and listened to well-documented stories told by the operations personnel. From now on, the AES will be open constantly for the conducting of free tours of this kind.

During the period of broad glasnost, in order to dispel the unfounded rumors concerning the danger that such stations represent for human beings and the environment, it has been decided to authorize all those who wish to do so to become acquainted locally with the true situation. After the tour, the participants underwent radiation-detection monitoring, and no negative readings on the instruments were detected.

"We are ready to accept organized tourist groups and individual visitors," AES director V. A. Korovkin said. "For that purpose we have trained qualified tour guides. Everyone will be able to be convinced for himself that we have guaranteed people's safety and that we are working with complete responsibility for the important work sector that has been assigned to us."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on Life in Shusha's 'Special District'

18300350 Moscow *KRASNAYA ZVEZDA* in Russian
14 Feb 89 p 2

[Article by Lt Col N. Belan, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent: "Shusha: Rhythm of Life. Report from Nagorno Karabakh"]

[Text] Shusha is a city-fortress, erected more than two centuries ago high in the mountains on an inaccessible rocky plateau with steep borders; it is the capital of the former Karabakh khanate, and it is known also as the city of 17 makhelle—quarters, 17 mosques and 17 springs.

The commandant's office of the fifth sector of the special district of Shusha and the Shushinskiy Rayon are situated in the military commissariat, which is in the center of the city, a 2- or 3-minute walk to the party raykom and the rayispolkom. The truth is, I wanted to meet first with V. Dzhaferov, first secretary of the rayon committee of the party and a member of the special administration committee of the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakhskaya Autonomous Oblast] but I missed him. I was told that

Vagif Dzhaferovich was making the rounds of the villages and that he would not return until evening.

"So, we will begin familiarization with our land without him," said Major V. Mamedov, military commandant of the district, with a broad smile.

Then he and Major S. [Sergey] Shumskiy, the military commandant of the sector, became guides. But, guides, is not entirely accurate. Of the local inhabitants, Mamedov felt he was rightly the boss, which is understandable. Major Shumskiy was born in the Don area, but he was also not a stranger. However, Sergey Mikhaylovich had been here for only the second month.

What is the special district of the NKAO? This is six sectors, each with its own commandant and people subordinate to him—the police, security troops of the MVD and soldiers of the Soviet Army. The special district can also be represented in this way. What is a sector commandant? First and foremost, he is responsible for maintaining public order in the territory entrusted to him. There are no primary and secondary districts here—each one is important. And the life of each one of them to a certain degree is a smaller portrait of the life and activity of the special district of the oblast.

We are standing in the center of Shusha, and above us it is one and a half thousand meters above sea level, and the sun is shining with a blinding brightness. There is a wall opposite us, across the road, that is built of stone. Springs gush from it, and the water is cold and hurts the teeth. The inscription on the wall reads: "The spring was built in 1878 by poetess Khurshudbanu Natavan, the daughter of Mekhtikuli khan."

But now we are talking with M. Shafiyevaya. She works as a tour guide in the museum of the composer U. Gadzhibekov.

"How can we, standing next to the great and spiritual heritage that has been bequeathed to us, argue about whose culture is more significant?" says Matanat. "The cultural heritage and the creativity of Gadzhibekov are international and do not belong to a single people but to everyone. The operetta 'Arshin mal alan', for example, has been translated into 56 languages of the world. In my opinion, there where they begin to speak about the exclusiveness of their own culture is where a gross lack of culture has its beginnings. . ."

About 2 weeks ago, while attending a meeting of one of the production collectives of the oblast, someone made the retort: what sort of democratic society is it when soldiers patrol the streets? V. Sidorov, a member of the special administration committee and an executive of the CPSU central committee, responded to this very precisely, hitting the mark: he says, and what kind of a democratic society will it be if we allow hooligans to

throw away all restraint, and if we do not maintain public order and a quiet and peaceful life for the citizens?

I saw three homes in Shusha that were burned down last year in the heat, so to say, of passions and emotions. But I was also told about something else in Shusha: museums and cultural monuments became the number one establishments and zones of special protection for soldiers who came here at that time.

At night I went with Major Shumskiy to check the guard posts. At one of them, whose chief was Lieutenant A. Zabiya, Private D. Tolstik, a White Russian and BMP [infantry fighting vehicle] machine gun operator, recounted:

"I have been in Nagorno Karabakh since the start of the events. I especially recall Stepanakert in September, it seems it was the 18th. There was disorder in the streets, there were wounded, and we were located right next to the hospital. They ran from the hospital to us: we need blood. Sergeant Krechko, Private Chernyy, and I—about 20 people from our subunit—gave blood then.

"Dmitriy," I ask, "do you know exactly to whom your blood was given?"

"To a person," I hear in answer.

Where are these people, who were victims of hooligans but who were saved with the blood of Russian, White Russian and Ukrainian boys? Kazakhs, Tadzhiks, Uzbeks, Estonians. . . And those who were discharged and those who continue to serve today. Perhaps among the passengers in the bus that was stopped at the KPP [checkpoint] whose documents soldiers are checking? I do not know. In any case, I want to believe that they were not among those in the "Zhigulinka" [subcompact car "Zhiguli"] in which knives and shotgun shells were found. For whom were the knives sharpened and for whom were the shells intended? . .

There are checks, guard posts on the roads, and patrols at the abandoned and sealed up homes whose owners became migrants and who hope to return here soon. This is also an aspect of today's Shusha. But, nonetheless, the main thing in it is tranquility and a normal working life.

We met, for example, with workers of an affiliate of the Bakinskiy radio plant. With a crew of press operators supervised by A. Gulyayev. We talked with I. Aliyeva, section foreman. Basically, young girls and boys work here. They readily talk about themselves, about production concerns and, until we raised the question directly, they did not mention problems of contacts among nationalities.

"We have neither claims nor resentments," answered I. Dzhaferov. "And we are waiting for those who left Shusha to come back—we have piles of work."

"There are now about 150 mixed families in the rayon, 27 Armenian families have remained in Shusha, and more than 1,000 Armenians—out of a total rayon population of a little more than 20,000, live in villages," said Z. Abbasov, the raykom party instructor. "And the people are living amicably. Take the Kolkhoz imeni Kirov, for example, half of its population is Armenian, and half is Azerbaijani. The chairman there is Z. Sarkisyan, an Armenian. He is a person who is respected by everyone. There are 11 communists at the Shushinskiy baking plant. Ten Azerbaijanians and Ashkhen Grigoryan, an Armenian woman. Do you know who their secretary is? Grigoryan. Yes, and my mother-in-law is an Armenian. It is all lies that there are some kinds of scores to be settled between our people. Malicious people have started an argument and are aggravating it.

What is a special district? Is it not really the very thoughts that people have, and is it not a state of the heart? True, I will not begin to speak fully for everybody. I will be careful. Otherwise, why would there be a special situation?

I keenly sensed this special rhythm of life and its still uneasy order in the commandant's office. Dozens of persons came here with pain and hope: "Help, comrade commandant." And the commandant helped everyone he could. . .

We met with the secretary of the party raykom in the morning. He rarely comes to his office—most of the time Vagif Dzhaferovich is among the people, wheeling from village to village and from kolkhoz to kolkhoz. He decides questions that arise on the spot, and he instructs the managers.

"Yesterday, I was in the Kolkhoz imeni Kirov," recounts Dzhaferov. "The management is switching to cost accounting. But this is the kind of picture that unfolds there: the salaries of the kolkhozniks amount to 180,000 rubles, and the income is 125,000 rubles. Why? The cost price of cattle-breeding production is high. There was a long search with the chairman about how to correct the state of affairs. An entire program was outlined.

Teaching how to manage, strengthening ideological work and educating the people—this is the formula that the first secretary of the raykom sees as the method for resolving acute economic and social problems, of which the residents of Shusha have quite a few.

What is a special district? It is the life that is woven from these difficulties. It depends on the people themselves as to how soon the district will get out of the quagmire of stagnation and move to a dynamic rate of development. That is the way the people of Shusha talked, understanding that the special situation is only temporary and that help is necessary to stabilize the situation and to guarantee order.

Upcoming Reorganization of Moldavian Light Industry Assessed

18000548 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA
in Russian 3 Feb 89 p 2

[Interview with S. A. Manukyan, Moldavian SSR minister of light industry, by V. Demidetskiy, ATEM correspondent: "Minister—Against Ministry"; date and place not specified]

[Text] The Commission for the Improvement of the Economic Mechanism under the USSR Council of Ministers approved a plan for the reorganization of the Ministry of Light Industry of Moldavia into the Republic Scientific-Industrial Concern during the first quarter of the present year. Our ATEM correspondent asked Moldavian SSR Minister of Light Industry S. A. Manukyan to explain what necessity has called forth such a transformation.

[Demidetskiy] Sergey Artavazdovich, we have already become used to frequent, but, frankly speaking, not always successful changes in the structure of the management of the economy. Will this not happen again this time?

[Manukyan] No. I am convinced of this—it is the fruit of hard lessons learned during the transition of the sector to self-financing. It must be acknowledged that the economic we have up to now has not created conditions where every worker would be genuinely interested in the flourishing of his enterprise. The introduction of khozranchet, unfortunately, was carried out on the basis of individual norms fitted under the five-year plan in the conditions of dictate on the part of the higher state organs. This is how it happened that more than 70 percent of the profit are now removed in light industry. The situation became complicated by the fact that five enterprises—Zorile, the Bendery Silk Combine, the Dubossary Sewing, and the Soroki and Beltsy Knitted-Wear factories still quite recently were subject to liquidation because lack of profitability.

We entered the new conditions of management with equipment that lagged 40 years behind the world level and with unsolved social questions and questions of everyday life. This was the result of the painful legacy of the expenditure-oriented economic policy—the acute shortage of working capital and other funds. In order, in these conditions, to balance the system of self-financing of the sector, an urgent financial "injection" of 160 million rubles is necessary. If we direct the profit earned into the filling of working capital up to the real demand, it will be necessary to "freeze" development of industries, which, as it is, are in acute need of technical equipment, and the material stimulation of the collectives working on a khozranchet basis.

[Demidetskiy] Some enterprise managers with whom I have talked propose a simple path—the next time to turn for financial assistance to the state...

[Manukyan] To solve the problems in this way is already impossible today, and the correct way out is as follows, the minister objects and points to a freshly-printed bond. This is a share of a commercial bank that has been created by us. It will be a joint stock company, whose capital accumulations will be made up of the funds received from the sale of securities to the workers of the enterprises, organizations, and cooperatives of the sector. But the main thing is that the commercial bank will become the financial propeller, the guarantor of the concern, whose goal is the same as that of the minister—to provide the population with quality clothing, footwear, and other consumer goods, to increase their contribution to the all-union market, and to accelerate the introduction of scientific-technical progress. But the concern has other methods of solving these tasks. Its structure is conducive to the cooperation of efforts of the branch enterprises and associations, supply organizations, wholesale and retail trade, marketing centers, fashion, and cooperatives in the interest of increasing production efficiency.

We were brought to the idea of creating the concern by the conviction that, without changes in the system of labor incentives, restructuring in the branch will turn into an ordinary talking-shop. Only having turned over the enterprises to those who are working in them is it possible to really interest every worker in the maintenance and efficient use of the fixed capital and the growth of labor productivity. The conditions for this are presented today by the collective contract and the lease. It is with them that the birth of our baby began.

[Demidetskiy] Khozrachet grants to the enterprises considerable independence in their rights and possibilities. Why, then, do they need control from above—I mean in the form of subordination to the concern? Moreover, the enterprises that enter into it legally also have the right to leave it...

[Manukyan] The concern also differs from the ministry in that its apparatus will not impose its will on the enterprises. Having preserved their economic and legal independence, they enter into it voluntarily, having discussed this step, in accordance with the Law on the State Enterprise (Association), at general meetings of the labor collectives.

As a qualitatively new type of production organization, the concern excludes management by administrative fiat and presupposes the transition to commodity-money relations and methods of economic self-management. Its highest organ will be the council. Besides the director of the commercial bank and the enterprise managers, its membership, we hope, will include representatives of the Council of Ministers, Gosplan, the Ministry of Finance, and Gossnab. The council will determine the volume of state orders and export, manage the market fund of the republic, develop goal-oriented integrated programs for the development of subdivisions and enterprises, as well

as the renewal of production, the equipment and technological base, the specialization and cooperation of production and funds, and discuss a number of other questions. Of considerable importance is the fact that the small apparatus of the council will be financed through deductions from the profit of the enterprises.

In present-day conditions, we cannot cope without a scientific research institute which takes on the implementation of all the stages of the cycle—"science—production," beginning from basic research to the experimental model of equipment and new technology.

In a parallel manner, effective use will be made of new forms of cooperation—the creation of joint enterprises and industries, the purchase of advanced technologies. Here tangible steps have already been taken—with the help of the Italian firm Lebole Moda the output of men's suits has been set into motion. In the production of footwear, we are successfully cooperating with colleagues from Bulgaria, Hungary, and Switzerland. A joint enterprise of Tiraspol sewing industry workers and the Brazilian firm Starup has been created for the output of clothes made of jeans material. This list could be continued.

In order to turn out clothing and footwear that meet the demands of the world market, the industry needs more than 400 designations of different equipment that is not produced in the USSR and the CEMA countries. For the time being, unfortunately, we are purchasing what they give us, but not always what we need. Frequently the machine tools for the production of model footwear make their appearance earlier than the equipment for the manufacture of high-quality leather. In order for this not to occur, plans call for a mobile foreign trade firm and a center for wholesale trade in means of production and commodities within the structure of the concern. This is not fantasy—already now we are selling our fabrics to such highly-developed countries as the United States, the FRG, Canada, and France.

[Demidetskiy] The word "concern" means an association of independent industrial enterprises to secure advantages for them in the sharp competitive struggle with other related enterprises. In our country there is an acute shortage of consumer goods. Will the concentration of means and capacities in these conditions not lead to a still more severe monopoly of the producer over the consumer, in particular, to an increase in prices?

[Manukyan] On the contrary, it destroys the monopoly of the producer. Previously, for any manager—from brigade leader to minister—the "first commandment commandment" was to fulfill the plan. The industry workers have shown an interest in a high price. And the measures to limit the increase in prices and to stimulate the output of inexpensive goods, which were undertaken by the union government not long ago, are perfectly correct. Nevertheless, the situation will not change until

the collectives of the enterprises will receive money for products sold, not to the customer, but to the trade.

In the conditions of the concern, we will ourselves begin to sell a significant part of our products and will be interested in doing this efficiently, in order to accelerate the turnover of the ruble, to secure the financial well-being of the collectives working in the conditions of self-repayment, and thus of economic risk. Of the enterprises producing identical products, that one will improve its financial well-being which manufactures the product of higher quality and sells it more rapidly. You agree, such a struggle implies also flexibility of prices and taking into account the interests of various strata of customers. In the economic substantiation of the creation of the concern it was calculated that the going out to the customer, bypassing the wholesale bases, will secure a significant acceleration of the turnover of funds.

I would like to add that in the structure of the concern there will also operate a special buro, which is called upon to defend the rights of the customer, all the way to compensation of not only the cost of articles of poor quality purchased by them, but also of the moral damage sustained.

[Demidetskiy] Sergey Artavazdovich, how has the idea of the formation of the concern been received?

[Manukyan] The expediency of its creation was approved by the Moldavian CP Central Committee, the republic Council of Ministers, and the USSR Gosplan. But this still does not mean that everything is going smoothly. Of this, we have already become convinced, having begun to put into effect the idea of the concern a year and a half ago. It proved possible to do something during this time, especially in the improvement of management. By 1991 the technical reequipment of the branch will be completed.

All of these and other measures lead to the final goal to which we aspire—to saturate the market with high-quality goods.

GSSR First Secretary's Speech at USSR Supreme Soviet Session

18300320a Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian
1 Dec 88 p 2

[Speech by Georgian CP Central Committee First Secretary D. I. Patiashvili at Extraordinary 12th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation: "Speech of Deputy D.I. Patiashvili (Sukhumi Electoral Okrug, Georgian SSR)"]

[Text] Comrade deputies! The present session of the Supreme Soviet is dealing with questions of special political significance and is taking place in an extraordinary political atmosphere. Society, intellectuals, and our

young people are more active than ever before; original ideas and judgments are being expressed. This is also confirmed by the nationwide discussion of bills presented at the session.

I cannot hide my nervousness and I won't try, because the keen attention of the whole country, of all the republics, is focused on what is taking place in this hall. We deputies are going to have to make responsible decisions which will determine the future of our society, Soviet statehood, and socialism as a whole.

We have seen for ourselves that governing society by democratic methods is immeasurably more complicated than by authoritarian methods. But democratization is the only way to make the social atmosphere healthy again, to overcome the social overcomplexification of the personality [zakompleksovanost lichnosti]. The maximally favorable conditions that have been created in the country for the people to express their will could hardly fail to bring about a certain polarization of opinions. But the healthy forces of society are consolidating and drawing closer together, as is attested by the session of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet that was held the other day, at which the spirit of genuine internationalism unanimously triumphed.

The forms of this expression of will, however, have not always proved acceptable; they have sometimes turned into undesirable excesses, and in this context we share completely the concern that was expressed at the meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. We must acknowledge self-critically that inadequate preparedness on the part of the organs of administration, including the republic's party committees, for operations under exceptional circumstances, also the lack of democratic traditions, had their consequences. We are learning a lesson and stepping up work with the masses.

Initial experience under conditions of democratization and glasnost has shown that only by relying on the people's opinion can we retain the main levers of social control and keep the situation in hand. Any hastiness or carelessness can with one blow wipe out the enormous political gains that have been won during the years of perestroika.

The republic's interest and involvement in the work of the session are enormous. Demonstrations numbering thousands of people have been held in the capital city. Today Mikhail Sergeyevich, your warm message to the workers of Soviet Georgia, the Georgian people, was read at a rally in Tbilisi. It was received with enormous enthusiasm and understanding.

If we discard unacceptable statements which are in conflict with the Fundamental Law of the country, attention was focused primarily on the national-state structure, the organic combination of federal and republic interests and, in this context, Paragraph 2, Article 108

and Paragraph 13, Article 119 of the Bill on Changes and Amendments to the USSR Constitution.

The roots of this go deep into the national psychology, and I should like to offer the deputies a few explanations. Over the past several centuries, the historic goal of the Georgian people and the other peoples of Georgia has been the struggle for survival and the creation of a unified, integral state. Coming under the protection of Russia saved the Georgian nation from physical extermination. Although demographic problems remained traditionally at the focus of public attention, Georgia acquired genuine statehood and sovereignty after the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Consequently, anything that touches upon this sphere in any way is taken very keenly and even painfully. You will recall from history that when the Soviet Federation was being formed, it was the Georgian communists who were among the first to come out against the Stalinist idea of "autonomization" of nations. And their position was fervently endorsed by V. I. Lenin in his last letters.

Genuine, secured sovereignty is a mighty generator of all-union and national energy, a means of overcoming the political alienation of the individual, and therefore the entire republic unanimously endorses our party's post-April course of perestroika. Strengthened sovereignty of the republics constitutes a substantial barrier in the path of excessive centralization and bureaucratization of power, a vital condition for making democratism more complete. Even now, after all, we can still cite numerous examples where Central bodies have made hasty decisions without even notifying the republic organs and labor collectives, where Central officials and even their deputies essentially give orders to the republic's government.

It is not a matter of arrogance, understand. Eventually, economic misunderstandings will be dealt with as a matter of course. It is a matter of mutual respect and mutual trust. Responsibility is nurtured by trust rather than exhortation. Only in this way can we reform the work style in the Center and in the outlying regions. We wholeheartedly endorse the decision concerning the drafting of documents regulating the sovereign rights of the union republics and on the creation of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision. This will make it possible to perfect the form of the state of law and will further strengthen our union. For together we are a mighty power, a unique community of nations and peoples united in a common goal. And this multiplies the strength of each republic!

At the same time, we will not be able to progress to the new model of society, to khozraschet socialism, unless we break up "bureaucratic centralism" and the omnipotence of the bureaucratic apparatus. Is it reasonable for the public energy to be expended in vain to overcome artificially erected barriers? And consider the cost of rectifying the bureaucrat's mistakes in the sphere of such eternal national values as culture and language!

This is why it is essential to exercise special care and caution when making any decisions which affect the inter-ethnic sphere, especially decisions affecting sovereignty, because it can be difficult to put a stop to raging emotions and passions.

I believe I speak not only for the republic but for all comrades when I emphasize that we are profoundly grateful to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee for their considerate, scrupulous handling of the proposals and criticisms that came in during the course of the discussion of the bills. We deputies, and the public at large, see this as the manifestation of real democratism in action.

New possibilities for deepening the process of democratization are opened up by the bill "On the Election of People's Deputies of the USSR," which merits approval. It also appears that Paragraph 2, Article 108 of the bill on amendments to the present edition of the Constitution meets the general requirements. Unquestionably, 11 instead of 7 deputies will more fully represent the interests of the union republics in the Soviet of Nationalities, in accordance with Article 111.

As for Paragraph 13, Article 119, it seems to us that it is essential to amend its new and indisputably improved edition (and here I am conveying to you the unified opinion of the republic's working people and public) with wording to the effect that the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet shall declare an emergency situation in individual localities at the request of or with the consent of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the particular republic.

Real, genuine respect for sovereignty is an excellent foundation for the further strengthening of the friendship and brotherhood of peoples, the shaping of genuinely internationalist views—especially among our young people—and the inculcation of love and respect for national cultures. These are eternal, sacred things, and we will not permit provocateurs and agitators of any stripe to sow and inflame inter-ethnic strife or bring discord into our harmonious family. History warns us that any indulgence for nationalist manifestations can only lead to national tragedies.

I think it is necessary in this case to apply the force of the law more fully, perhaps even to make the wording more severe. In order to learn a lesson from Mikhail Sergeyevich's justified reproach at the meeting of the Presidium and the Central Committee Plenum and truly avoid a feeling of being on the defensive, we must unite even closer together, coordinate our efforts better, and allow fewer oversights and mistakes.

We have whole scientific-research and academic institutes and centers studying problems of literally all the continents of the planet, almost all of the countries of the world from Canada to Guadeloupe, but we do not have

an institute studying our own unique country, commonwealth, federation, and inter-ethnic relations, unfortunately. For this reason, we are experiencing an acute shortage of useful scientific recommendations concerning inter-ethnic problems within the country.

Our press, especially the Central press, our publicists and writers, the whole intelligentsia, have an enormous role and responsibility. Sometimes, unfortunately, we are again witness to ill-considered actions and publications which seem to take special pains, as if maliciously, to injure people, to offend their national feelings and generate protest and indignation. This produces extremely negative consequences and diminishes the effectiveness of our efforts. I consider it essential to repeat once more that it is wrong to make the kolkhoz market counter the criterion of inter-ethnic relations; it is wrong to generalize social and domestic flaws on grounds of nationality; it is wrong to ascribe the negative traits of an individual to national character. It is radically wrong! Our power and our strength lie only in unity and mutual respect!

Comrades! Perestroyka has literally overturned many customary concepts and notions. It has revealed to us the face of true democracy. But let us be frank: we are just learning the rudiments of it; we are just learning how to properly evaluate the true advantages of the freedoms offered to society. Most of us were brought up on different principles, and it is not so easy to do away with it all at once. The main thing, however, is that it was the party which launched perestroyka; this is why its authority is so high, because the very possibility of pluralism is the exclusive gain of perestroyka.

The bills that have been introduced for discussion at the session mark the first stage in the perfecting of the political system of our society. It could be the most crucial stage. It will largely determine the entire subsequent course of perestroyka, the conditions for the further consolidation of all social strata, of all the nations and peoples of our great Motherland on the platform of perestroyka. Therefore, every one of us today must manifest special circumspection and consideration.

We fully endorse the Central Committee's course of action toward the fundamental transformation of our society. It is the greatest mission assigned to our generation. Let us therefore be politically, civically, and morally worthy of it! (Applause).

Patiashvili Remarks at Tbilisi Gorkom Meeting on November Unrest

*18300320b Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian
28 Dec 88 pp 1-2*

[Gruzinform report on the 41st Tbilisi Party Organization Conference: "Perestroyka Is Each and Every One's Business. From the Conference of the Tbilisi City Party Organization"]

[Text]

The Times Set Forth the Problems

The processes of perestroyka are accompanied by contradictions, the struggle of the old with the new. This is not surprising. Bold revolutionary transformations cannot proceed without errors and opposition; new developments inevitably give rise to new problems. An already difficult situation has been made more difficult by the terrible tragedy that has befallen fraternal Armenia. Communists of Georgia and its capital city, like all the working people of our republic and the whole country, people all over the world, have been profoundly saddened by the tragedy of the Armenian people.

It looks like a reopening of "the wounds of Armenia" which were described almost 150 years ago by the great Armenian illuminator and democrat Khachatur Abovyan. Today all of us share these wounds, and healing them is our common cause. Georgia has already contributed more than 12 million rubles to the special account. These have been augmented by the addition of another four million rubles earned by labor collectives in mass subbotniks. The republic's sanatoria and vacation homes have already taken in 10,000 suffering children and mothers. Several thousand more places have been allocated for the purpose.

Our medical personnel, student construction detachments, mountain rescue teams, communications workers, railroad men, pilots, automotive transport workers, scientists, engineers, and specialists have distinguished themselves in rescue and rebuilding work. The republic's working people are sending warm clothing, footwear, and underwear to the stricken people and are ready to give them temporary shelter.

About 4000 persons have donated blood.

No one has been indifferent, there are no spectators on the sidelines!

These days the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, the republic's Council of Ministers, and other governmental bodies are receiving large numbers of letters and telegrams, and phones are constantly ringing. These letters and telephone calls are from ordinary workers, eminent scientists, writers, women, old men, mothers, and children. All are expressing the desire to make a specific contribution to the noble cause of helping the victims.

The process of perestroyka is proceeding with difficulty, the conference has stated. It is being hindered especially badly by the actions of extremist informal associations. The disgraceful thing is that the activities of these groups are taking on a pronounced nationalist, antisocial, anti-state character. This has worsened even further the political and ideological atmosphere in the republic, as was emphasized at the recent meeting of the party economic aktiv. Unlawful acts, unsanctioned rallies, parades, and demonstrations are taking up a lot of the

time of the population, in particular our young people. Most important, all of this exerts a negative effect on the moral-political climate and on the mood of the people. The situation is complicated further by the fact that these groups are turning directly to active, deliberate actions, attempting to destabilize the situation and, in a number of cases, attempting to launch an obviously political struggle for power. Naturally, this severely complicates the efforts of party, soviet, and economic organs, the work of the law enforcement services, and generates in the people a feeling of fear, distrust, and doubt, and complicates inter-ethnic relations.

Extremist elements hesitate at nothing; they utilize everything—blatant disinformation and slander, provocation, and even mass hunger strikes.

That these acts are blatantly provocative in nature is attested by the mere fact that the organizers of the hunger strike did not put a stop to it even after the announcement of the decisions of the Presidium of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet and the session of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet concerning changes and amendments to the USSR Constitution, changes which were received with great satisfaction by the absolute majority of the republic's people. This did not stop the agitators. The demagogues continued to whip up unhealthy emotions. It got to a point where they openly proclaimed blatantly nationalistic, anti-Soviet, anti-communist slogans and grossly insulted the Soviet state and social structure. They made threats against particular party and soviet officials and called for new strikes and the destruction of party and Komsomol cards.

All of these actions disrupted the work rhythm of industrial enterprises and the activities of many institutions of learning and administrative organs; they complicated the life of the city, the operation of public transport, and municipal services. In short, an alarming situation was created which might have resulted in totally unforeseen consequences. It is to the credit of many party committees and soviet and law enforcement organs that under the circumstances they manifested the necessary level of organization, restraint, and reason.

Eminent figures in science and culture took active part in the effort. Many representatives of the intelligentsia manifested a high ideological level and the ability to defend genuine party stances and the ideas of perestroika. Also gratifying is the fact that eminent scientists, writers, and cultural figures unanimously called the young people to reason, made direct appeals to the participants in the rallies at Government House, and spoke out in the press, on the radio, and on television. Actively joining in this were representatives of the working class, students, young workers in the arts, leaders of the creative unions, party veterans, ministers, members of the Central Committee and the Tbilisi Gorkom, and members of the Presidium of the republic's Academy of Sciences.

A major role in stabilizing the situation was played by M. S. Gorbachev's appeal, which was broadcast on radio and television. It was an excellent example of how a kind word from deep in the heart can heal, can lift people's spirits, so to speak, giving them new strength and energy and rallying them to valuable, useful, genuinely good deeds. Gorbachev's appeal expressed deep confidence that Georgia's communists would be calm and firm in dealing with the situation and that Georgia's young people would demonstrate their faith in the ideals of the friendship of peoples.

Participants in the conference have emphasized, nevertheless, that these extremist actions became possible because of serious shortcomings in the organizational and political work of party organizations. They stated directly that many of the organizations had lost their vanguard role, the qualities of genuine warriors. Many party and Komsomol organizations are lacking in political vigilance and the ability to work calmly, without haste, under difficult and extraordinary conditions. They are not manifesting the necessary level of organization, principles, commitment, and aggressiveness.

The tenseness of the situation was also exacerbated by the fact that the ideological aktiv did not go into action fast enough, nor were eminent, authoritative representatives of the intelligentsia enlisted soon enough. In turn, this made it impossible for the party organizations to make a cardinal breakthrough in the public consciousness, in particular the consciousness of young people. As a result, the activities of many party, soviet, and state organs were insufficiently vigorous, purposeful, and decisive; serious ideological mistakes became possible.

For Exemplary Public Order in the City

The destabilization of the situation in the city also hampered the activities of the administrative organs. The necessary control was lacking in many spheres. The operational situation deteriorated badly. Twice as many crimes were recorded in the republic's capital city between 22 and 29 November as during the same period last year, including two premeditated murders and four crimes resulting in grave bodily harm, cases of robbery, burglary, auto thefts, serious road and vehicle accidents, and others. Last year, moreover, all the crimes except one had been solved by that time; this year only 70 percent of the crimes have been solved.

Among the organizers and participants in these antisocial acts are many immoral people, corrupt elements who collected funds for the participants in the unsanctioned rallies and for transportation. An outrageous crime was committed by one Isakadze, age 30, who is the head of the meat-curing shop in the Saburtalo Cooperative. While in an intoxicated condition, and with the aid of several responsible workers, he managed to climb onto

the roof of the Government House, and there he committed an assault on the State Flag of the Georgian SSR. Criminal proceedings have now been instituted against him.

When it comes to establishing exemplary public order in the city, participants in the conference stated, we must also certainly touch upon problems of combatting bribe-taking, extortion, protectionism, and other negative phenomena, because it is impossible to discuss policies if all kinds of wheeler-dealers, bribe-takers, and scoundrels are still active among us. People such as Meri Doreuli, for example, who was once sentenced to six years in prison for taking bribes, was released ahead of term four months later, and was again arrested in November of this year. In the trunk of the car which she was driving they found bundles of money totaling 140,000 rubles.

It turned out that this money was part of 200,000 rubles which Doreuli and her confederates—one Toroshelidze, an engineer in Gruzzhilremproyekt, and one Tvildiani (who had already managed to hide from investigation)—obtained by fraud from one Gakheladze, the director of the Tskhinvali Cannery, Pliyeva, the head engineer, Meladze, a shop chief, and Terashvili, the head of a laboratory in the plant. Doreuli and her confederates had undertaken to "fix" a criminal case instituted in connection with major thefts at the enterprise. In addition, the woman represented herself as having a position in the republic's Council of Ministers with access to officials.

The question was justifiably asked, How long was this going to go on? Who was this Doreuli? Who was covering for her? Why was she released ahead of time after committing a malicious crime? Who was supporting her?

A number of Tbilisi medical workers have been caught taking bribes in the past two years. Eight years in prison was the sentence imposed on Professor Georgadze, formerly the deputy chief physician in the Scientific-Research Institute of Traumatology and Orthopedics, who accepted 4000 rubles from a dentist for help in getting a job.

Bribe-taking has not been done away with in a number of VUZes, involving cases of enrolling secondary school graduates there. One Kobakhidze, a laboratory assistant in the Georgian Polytechnic Institute, was sentenced to 10 years in prison for taking 31,000 rubles from the parents of secondary school graduates.

One Razmadze, a woman precinct passport clerk in Housing Operations Precinct No 106, Tbilisi's Zavod Rayon, was sentenced to five years deprivation of freedom after having accepted 8000 rubles for helping someone get a residence permit and join a housing construction cooperative. The Gldani Rayon Court sentenced one Zurmukhtashvili, a garbage-processing foreman in the Tbilisi Gorispolkom's Planning and Development Administration, to six years deprivation of freedom for

accepting a 2500-ruble bribe for allowing private persons to let their pigs feed at the dump.

In this connection, an especially outrageous situation has developed in the various offices of the rayispolkoms where residents of the city go with their needs and concerns but where they frequently encounter bureaucracy, callousness, and extortion. Thus, for issuing a permit to build an addition to a private home, one Begiashvili, the senior architectural engineer in the 26 Commissars Rayispolkom, accepted a bribe in the amount of 3000 rubles; for this he was sentenced to eight years deprivation of freedom. Criminal proceedings have been instituted against one Charkviani, the senior engineer in Housing Operations Administration No 21, Lenin Rayon, who took a bribe for issuing a permit for the private remodeling of a communal apartment. Nada-reishvili, the former deputy head of the Intersectorial Territorial Association of the Kalinin Rayispolkom, was sentenced for taking a bribe and for abuse of office.

People in the cooperative movement are taking an indulgent attitude toward serious abuses. In addition to the fact that this sphere of activities has attracted persons gaining unearned income through various kinds of machinations and shady deals, many officials who are responsible for dealing with questions relating to the formation and functioning of cooperatives are also taking every opportunity to fatten their wallet.

The story relating to the Sikharuli Cooperative attracted some publicity. The proprietors of this kindergarten boarding facility were taking 300 rubles per month from highly-placed parents for keeping children around the clock and 200 rubles per month for daytime attendance at this prestigious kindergarten.

It turned out that in May and June of this year the Housing and Social Services Bank [Zhilsotsbank] in Saburtalo Rayon issued long-term credit in the amount of about 200,000 rubles to Mshvelidze, the chairman of this so-called "cooperative." Yet the finance and banking organs of Ordzhonikidze and Saburtalo rayons not only failed to verify the justification for issuing that large an amount to the cooperative, Panchulidze, the head of the technical department of the Saburtalo Rayon Zhilsotsbank, was guilty of an abuse. He is being charged with taking a bribe in the amount of 4000 rubles, having been caught just as he was returning 1000 rubles from that amount to the chairman of the cooperative. The city's procuracy is investigating this criminal matter.

Other abuses have been committed in the cooperatives of the city. Skhulukhiya, a brigade leader in the Lile-87 Cooperative of the republic's Ministry of Local Industry, a man who had been sentenced earlier for thefts in especially large amounts, used 1500 rubles to buy a ton of polypropylene that had been stolen by one Petriashvili, the manager of a Khimsbyt warehouse. The Gurman Cooperative in Saburtalo Rayon, which specializes in the production, processing, and sale of fish cuisine products,

bought 20 tons of catfish in Astrakhan at 68 kopecks per kilogram. Without any processing whatsoever, the cooperative members attempted to sell the fish in Tbilisi at four rubles per kilogram.

Kiknavelidze, the chairman of the Ketili Shroma Cooperative affiliated with the Gantiadi Production Association in the former Ministry of Consumer Services, who had been convicted several times previously for different kinds of economic crimes, was sentenced to three years deprivation of freedom. He appropriated 5000 rubles received from Gosbank for the acquisition of various kinds of equipment. He also carried out a non-commodity transaction involving the fictitious delivery of twig brooms worth 37,500 rubles to the board of directors of the tea factories of Makharadze Rayon.

Also cited at the conference were disgraceful examples of breakdown in state discipline, lack of supervision, and irresponsibility that were uncovered in the capital city's bakery products trade network. Just a few of the stores accounted for the theft of about one half million rubles. Especially disturbing is the fact that most of the perpetrators are married women. Investigation is underway now. All of the guilty parties have been identified, also the organizations involved in the illegal peddling of the people's property.

Several days ago some substandard boiled sausage produced by the sausage facility in the Tbilmyaso Production Association (general director R. Antadze, production manager G. Kartvelishvili) was found in the trade network. An inspection at the enterprise brought to light an even more scandalous picture. Out of seven kinds of sausage and bologna submitted for examination, five did not meet standard specifications due to excessive moisture content. These facts are alarming, of course, but even more disgraceful is the fact that despite the existence of numerous control organs, technology services, and inspectorates, we have yet to develop a flexible system capable of eliminating defective work at any stage of the production and consumption of goods; this paves the way for numerous abuses.

Recently we have been speaking with increasing frequency and insistence about the necessity of firmly and consistently implementing the principles of social justice, of seeking ways and means to ensure it in practice. But what kind of social justice can there be when there is no end to such socially disgraceful and dangerous phenomena as bribe-taking, extortion, embezzlement, and protectionism? For this reason, the speakers have emphasized, we must strive diligently to implement the principle of social justice in all spheres of life—the economy, politics, the social and spiritual/intellectual spheres, and the sphere of inter-ethnic relations. V. I. Lenin considered the idea of justice to be a great idea which stirs the masses of working people to action all over the world.

At the present stage, conference participants noted, the prime task is to strengthen the political upbringing of communists, enhance their ideological tempering and shape their fighting qualities. Without this it will be difficult to do away with negative phenomena, ensure the consolidation of healthy social forces, systematically carry out the party's course of action in all spheres of endeavor, accelerate processes of perestroika, and reinforce our internationalist unity. It is essential to evaluate ongoing events in the various localities in a principled manner and orient communists and workers correctly in the most difficult situations. It is essential to make it a rule to discuss the most important economic and social-political problems among the people, taking account of public opinion, in particular such high-priority problems as draft projects of state programs of economic and social development and so on.

All of the ideological-educational work of the city party organization must be made more purposeful, vigorous, and aggressive. This is extremely important in view of the fact that, as a result of provocative actions by extremist groups, there is still tension in the city. Moreover, a wave of antisocial activity is spreading to other regions of the republic, in particular such autonomous formations and districts where national minorities live.

Our republic, especially Tbilisi, is renowned for its wonderful traditions of friendship and brotherhood among peoples of various nationalities. Thanks to this, the unique term "Tbilisian" has become established; thanks to this, Tbilisoba has become a true celebration of the spiritual unity of peoples.

Lately we have been speaking a great deal about the importance of inter-ethnic relations, of strengthening the friendship of peoples, of internationalism. But we need more than talk; we need real, practical action, specific efforts to remove the obstacles along the way, conference participants emphasized. Unless all the generations together make the effort to continue and enrich the traditions of friendship and brotherhood, these traditions could wind up relegated to history. And what we need are not museum pieces but live, effective traditions fighting for the wellbeing of the people.

It is no secret that we have yet to put into action considerable reserves for further perfecting inter-ethnic relations. And if we want to activate them, we will have to make decisive efforts to get rid of the bacilli of formalism in political and ideological-educational work. We will have to renounce superficiality and ostentation and pay more attention to the development of informal relations between people of different nationalities; we must uphold the principles of social justice and not put off until tomorrow the task of resolving social and domestic problems. We must keep in mind that failure to take timely steps to solve even the slightest social-economic problems can result in an insurmountable barrier on the path of inter-ethnic relations.

High culture in such relations is inconceivable unless the political culture of the public, especially young people, is just as high. For this reason, it is essential that we always educate the rising generation in the spirit of patriotic and internationalist ideals, teach them to respect other peoples, and fight decisively against extremes either of national nihilism or nationalism. The whole of mankind's experience proves that the ideology of national superiority is blind and destructive and leads to racism. Everything of a national character merits support and respect—unless one's natural and completely understandable love for one's own people, and pride in its past and present, turns into nationalist conceit, arrogance, and haughty attitudes toward other peoples and their traditions and accomplishments.

Speakers at the conference have noted that our way of life cannot tolerate any manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism. Any advocacy of national superiority is offensive to all peoples, including the people to which such superiority is attributed. The important thing is that any specific decision must take account of the interests of all the people of all nations and nationalities and society as a whole. Each one of us—communist or non-party member, intellectual or worker—must fully recognize that the struggle for internationalist brotherhood is also the struggle for the future of one's own people, the struggle to preserve its uniqueness, develop the national culture, and win a worthy place in the great family of mankind.

Despite the fact that the reporting period covers three years, the conference focused special attention on the most recent stage, and this is not by accident. For the republic's party organization, in particular the Tbilisi organization, recent months have been a time of most serious testing of its political-organizational work, a time of serious examination.

Everything has been examined. Both its strong and its weak sides have been scrutinized. Unfortunately, there are a great many weak sides. This is why special attention has been paid to shortcomings, oversights, and unresolved problems. The delegates have made an in-depth analysis of the work done. They have mapped out the tasks of the future. It has been observed that the current unfavorable political situation is the result of the unsatisfactory handling of the ideological work of the Tbilisi Gorkom, the raykoms, and the primary party organizations.

A number of urgent problems on the agenda need to be resolved. Conference participants have called for enhancing the fighting trim of the party organizations, for increasing the democratization of their activities. We must take decisive steps to enhance the vanguard role of the primary party organizations in every labor collective. Another serious task is that of expanding the independence of the party organizations. We must free them of petty tutelage and enhance the authority of the secretaries of the party organizations and the party organizations

themselves, provide incentives for them to work better, and get rid of passivity and indifference. We are talking about enhancing the party-mindedness of every communist, every party member. Perhaps this sounds somewhat paradoxical. But that's just the way things stand today. It is a most vital task.

It is essential to change the style of work radically, because the bureaucratic-command style of leadership still prevails in organizational and political activities. Links between the masses and the party committees are insufficient. Many leaders lack the skills for political and ideological work, and they are sometimes lacking in aggressiveness, the ability to work under extraordinary conditions.

The Economy—The Basis of Social Policy

In dealing with the tasks of the republic's economic and social development, a special role is assigned to the capital city's party organization. One fifth of the republic's population lives in Tbilisi. The city accounts for 28 percent of workers and employees working in Georgia's national economy, almost one third of industrial enterprises and residential buildings put into operation, 38 percent of the city's housing inventory, and almost one third of the volume of consumer and trade services provided to the population. Tbilisi today has more than 230 major industrial enterprises, more than 100 scientific institutions, 200 general-education schools, 15 professional theaters, and so on. Tbilisi has always set the tone of the republic's political and social-economic life, set its standard, and represents its calling card. Speakers at the conference held a detailed discussion of the capital city's economic and social development. They have expressed alarm over the fact that purely political and party methods of dealing with social-economic problems are being utilized so slowly and indecisively. Party organizations have failed to do away with duplication of state and economic organs, tutelage; they are not implementing the party's course of action very convincingly in various spheres of the national economy and the activities of state and economic organs; they are failing to use communists working in the labor collectives for this purpose.

Speakers noted that it is essential to step up the efforts of the labor collective councils in the enterprises. Especially since many of them have been left on their own. Obviously, it is essential to look into these formations as soon as possible. It may be useful to hold regional conferences of the leaders of these councils. Responsibility for organizing such meetings and preparing the appropriate recommendations can be assigned to the Georgian Trade Union Council in conjunction with republic committees.

It will be necessary to improve the territorial aspects of *khozraschet*, including on the city level, with the help of the territorial-sectorial association of the *gorsoviet's* *ispolkom*. This association must pay more attention to the task of expanding the production of consumer goods.

Item: As of 1 May 1987, only 120 out of 233 enterprises in the city were producing consumer goods; by 1 December 1988, the number of such enterprises had risen to 220.

Speakers at the conference have called for more vigorous exploitation of opportunities to set up joint enterprises with foreign organizations. This will make it possible to greatly increase the hard currency funds of the city's enterprises and create conditions for acquiring the latest equipment and technology. The functions of the territorial-intersectoral associations have been substantially expanded since the adoption of the USSR Law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR."

Conference participants have focused attention on a number of topical problems in the cooperative movement. They have noted that correct efforts in this sphere will largely determine how well the people's consumer goods and services are met and, overall, rectify monetary circulation in the republic.

In practice, unfortunately, extremely unethical—even negative—phenomena have been found instead of improvement. At present there are more than 4000 cooperatives operating in the republic; one out of every four is in Tbilisi. What kind of cooperatives are we developing? What kinds of questions are involved in providing them with state credit? Most important, what results are they producing? These are questions which should be the concern of everyone today.

Especially disturbing is the amount of funds coming from state enterprises and organizations as a result of the cooperatives' cashless sales of goods produced, also outside the republic. Cashless sales account for almost half of goods totaling 83.5 million rubles produced by the cooperatives of Tbilisi alone. Over 11 percent comprise services rendered to the people of other republics. Naturally, this has an adverse effect on fulfillment of the republic's cash plan and worsens the imbalance of the people's monetary income and outgo. Everyone can see this and is aware of it, and measures are supposedly being taken to rectify the situation. But no results are forthcoming. In fact, the republic's specialized banks have to this day failed to analyze how the cash is being spent that has been taken out by the cooperatives in the form of loans, yet they have been issued over 100 million rubles. We have yet to work out a mechanism which would make it possible to monitor the use of state credit. The fact is that the cooperatives' overdue payments to the banks now exceed a million rubles, and for most of the cooperatives the dates for repayment of the loans have yet to fall due.

A major role in the formation of cooperatives is played by the gorispolkoms and rayispolkoms, which should in fact, by virtue of their decision, strengthen the program of activities of each cooperative. But local organs are derelict in their duties in that frequently the consumer service cooperatives do not provide services directly to

the people. The ispolkoms are permitting them to provide services to state enterprises and organizations. They must be called to account in this matter. For example, why should institutions which have their own staffs of janitorial personnel, be provided this service by the cooperatives? And how can we justify the fact that construction cooperatives which do not have the necessary materials are getting them from the retail trade network for state enterprises and organizations? Such materials are supposed to be for the public.

The same thing can be said about cooperatives producing consumer goods. The number of such cooperatives is growing day by day. Instead of supplying goods directly to the public, however, they are supplying them to enterprises and organizations, which gives rise to a number of negative phenomena. The cooperative Progress, a producer of parquet flooring in 26 Commissars Rayon, was carrying out its financial activities via non-commodity transactions.

The public is justifiably dissatisfied with the activities of many public food service cooperatives. Many such cooperatives do not have their own base of operations to produce goods, and they compete with the public in purchasing food products on the kolkhoz market. This serves to boost prices on food products and worsens the shortage.

Sanitation and hygienic conditions in the public food service cooperatives are very poor. This year alone, the sanitary inspection service in Tbilisi closed down the operations of 54 cooperatives, and 123 citizens lost their right to make food products. Cases of noncompliance with regulations governing the shipping and storage of products were discovered in the Mukhranis Veli and Tavtavi cooperatives in Saburtalo Rayon, Mgvime Cooperative in Pervoye Maya Rayon, Shroma in Ordzhonikidze Rayon, and Mirazh in Kalinin Rayon. An inspection in Tbilisi brought to light 17 cooperatives whose existence the sanitation-epidemiological station was not even aware of. Such an attitude is extremely intolerable. The ispolkoms must change their attitude toward such matters and exercise more control.

The territorial-intersectoral associations must get more actively involved in these matters and accept responsibility for dealing with numerous problems facing the cooperatives, providing them with methodological aid and helping in the development of their material-technical base. It is also necessary to take immediate steps to develop a unified, effective mechanism to regulate cooperative activities, solve problems with their material-technical supplies, price formation, accounting, and control. More attention must be paid to converting unprofitable enterprises to the contract piece-work system.

It is absolutely essential to intensify production. This will require the maximum application of qualitative factors of economic growth. Problems of improving

product quality must be brought to the forefront; hackneyed practices that have become entrenched in this sphere must be done away with; the way must be opened wide to scientific-technical progress.

No less important is the task of stepping up efforts to economize on material and fuel and energy resources.

Item: Wasteful methods of management still prevail in such enterprises as the Pervoye Maya Sewn Goods Factory, the Worsted Fabrics Combine, the Casting Equipment Plant, and the Agregat Plant. Targets for the conservation of ferrous metals are not being met by enterprises in Lenin, 26 Commissars, and Saburtalo rayons; cement conservation targets are not being met by enterprises in Pervoye Maya and Gldani rayons; and fuel conservation targets are not being met by enterprises in Kalinin and Pervoye Maya rayons. In 1987, Transstroy of Transcaucasia consumed more than 100 tons of cement on projects not included in the plan, 40 tons of rolled metal, and over 200 rolls of roofing. Losses of petroleum products are high, and measures to conserve resources smack of formalism. The matter of replacing liquid fuel with liquified gas has yet to be fully settled.

Local organs, in particular the territorial-intersectorial associations, are not paying enough attention to the introduction of waste-free and resource-conserving technologies and the use of nontraditional forms of energy.

Many enterprises and organizations are still having serious financial difficulties. A great many enterprises are wasting material, labor, and financial resources on the production of low-quality goods. Nonproductive spending and losses are inexcusably high. Bookkeeping and accounting are not properly organized, resulting in the theft of material goods.

Item: One out of every seven enterprises in the city has failed to fulfill the 10-month plan. Production associations such as Stankostroitel, Gruzelektromash, Gruzelkhodz mash, and the Tsentrolit Plant are lagging far behind. The Gantiadi Association is going to have to pay out almost five million rubles, while Elektrovozostroitel will have to pay out 6.6 million.

The Main Thing: Concern for People

The new social orientation of the economy requires systematic and purposeful implementation of the slogan "Everything for Man, Everything for the Good of Man." And this requires that every effort be directed toward accelerating the supply of a variety of goods for the market and expanding the sphere of services. Despite successful completion of targets stipulated in the integrated program for the production of consumer goods, there are still serious problems in this sphere. In exploring the causes of this, speakers have stated that many of them are generated by the provisions of the regulating documents as well as inadequate coordination of the economic operations of the enterprises and associations

themselves. The situation is also aggravated by the fact that problems of material-technical supply are still unsolved, and economic incentives to fulfill intensive plans are inadequate. In a number of enterprises, for example the jewelry plant, the Stankostroitel and Gruzelektromash associations, and the Iveriya Factory, the volume of production of consumer goods totals 40 million rubles less than the indicators stipulated in the republic's integrated program. Party organizations must assess these facts in a principled manner and not just go along with economic executives. It is intolerable for the public to be experiencing a shortage of consumer goods, construction materials, light industry products, and many other commodities.

Here are some findings from a study of public opinion: 66 percent of those questioned complain about trade services, 63.4 percent complain about the city's sanitary conditions, 53.1 percent complain about the pedestrian portion of the streets, 51.2 percent complain about housing conditions, 50.1 percent complain about medical services. Hence, the progress that has been made in the capital city's trade and services is obviously inadequate. Violations, discourtesy, and cases of failure to meet plan targets have become practically the norm.

The reason: Work on the selection and placement of cadres is not well organized. During the reporting period there was an observed tendency toward a reduction of the party stratum [prosloyka] in the sector. Many trade outlets lack party influence.

In the space of two years, the number of CPSU members declined by 8 percent or more in the trade and public food service enterprises of October Rayon, 13.4 percent in Kalinin Rayon, and 7 percent in Kirov Rayon. Very unsatisfactory work is being done by deputy rayispolkom chairmen in charge of trade—yet this institution was created specially.

How do things stand in regard to providing the public with a steady supply of food products? As we know, organizational measures were taken with just that purpose. The Tbilisi Agroindustrial Combine was set up, subordinate both to the republic State Agroindustrial Committee and the Tbilisi Gorispolkom.

Yet the situation still remains unsatisfactory. Physiological consumption norms are not being met with respect to a single kind of product. The level of adequacy ranges between 60 and 70 percent. Gardabani, Marneuli, Mtskheta, and other rayons of the republic are failing to fulfill plans of production and delivery of agricultural goods. Tbilisi's agroindustrial system is not functioning effectively. We have failed to establish business relations with the appropriate republic agroindustrial services—the Gardabani Agroindustrial Combine, and the agroindustrial associations of Marneuli and Mtskheta rayons. It is also necessary to adjust the mechanism of reciprocal economic relations. The duties of task-performing entities [ispolniteli] remain vague, and their

efforts lack coordination. Plans regularly go unfulfilled in regard to supplying the populace with beef, poultry, and eggs. In this regard, the situation is especially depressing at the end of the year.

The State Agroindustrial Committee, the Ministry of Trade, and the board of directors of Tsekavshiri must work more consistently to solve problems and absolutely eliminate the gap in the procurement and delivery of meat, eggs, and other products.

The Tbilisi Gorkom must do everything it can to help the Tbilisi agroindustrial system and other departments and organizations. It is essential to improve liaison between city and suburban raykoms. The republic State Agroindustrial Committee is responsible for improving the present system of supplying the city with fruit and vegetables; it must set up large trade and procurement firms with their own stores, transportation, and equipment.

The condition of the roads is unsatisfactory. More than half the city's population complains about ruts and potholes, the lack of manhole covers, and the fact that the sidewalk curbs are constantly being replaced—while the street paving needs to be repaired, the quality of the work is extremely low, street department crews do the same work over several times, and frequently new-laid asphalt is broken up again. All of this takes place because of the lack of needed coordination among the various departments.

Overall, housing remains the most serious and urgent problem. That was the opinion of one out of every two persons questioned. People are seriously concerned by the fact that just about one out of every five families in Tbilisi now is on the waiting list to improve housing conditions. To provide them with apartments by the year 2000, the integrated program calls for doubling the present volume of housing construction by 1990, increasing it to 1.2 million square meters per year.

Yet, plan targets for the operational completion of residential buildings go unmet every year in the city. To rectify the situation it is necessary to increase the volume of cooperative housing construction; at present, this sector accounts for only 10 to 20 percent of all the housing built in a year. Measures must be taken to greatly increase the volume of housing construction by the direct labor method [khodzposob].

Radical improvements must be made in the quality of construction. After the adoption of the state acceptance system for residential buildings, significant progress was made in this regard. However, substantial improvement in the situation is hampered by the low quality of the parquet flooring, cabinetry, and plumbing products.

It is especially urgent to make cardinal improvements in the quality of construction in the wake of the Armenian

tragedy. It is too early now to draw definitive conclusions in connection with the tragedy. It is clear, however, that the enormous destruction that hit those districts was due to serious violations in the whole technological cycle of construction, as is attested by failure to comply with seismostability standards. It is desirable that our own designers and builders pay heed to this and draw the necessary conclusions in good time. The city's party and soviet organs must not neglect these matters.

It is also necessary to ensure democratic supervision over the assignment of apartments. This is extremely important, because there are still many complaints about violations in regard to the assignment of apartments in the city.

A great deal has been done lately to enforce procedures in the city. This is especially gratifying to Tbilisians. But there are still a great many unresolved problems. For example, 39 percent of the public is dissatisfied with communal services, especially the water supply and residential heating.

Justified complaints have been expressed about the work of the administration of housing operations. Even though this subunit has quite a substantial personnel staff—13,000 persons, 571 of them members of the CPSU—in actuality it is just standing on the sidelines in regard to dealing with the main task, namely satisfying citizens' demands having to do with fixing utility lines and equipment.

There are also many unresolved problems in the city's water system. Although Tbilkanalizatsiya, which employs 4150 persons, including 232 communists, has somewhat improved the water supply, numerous shortcomings still persist. Heating lines are in poor condition, not enough funds are being spent to repair them, there are numerous technical breakdowns in the operating systems, and even rudimentary hermetic sealing is lacking in the buildings. The heating operations department, which employs 5000 persons (including 382 communists) is occupied chiefly in repairing damage and is not in a position to take necessary preventive measures.

The city's housing and communal services department is staffed with unqualified specialists. The conversion of the administration of this sector to the new methods is proceeding too slowly. Progressive forms of service are not being introduced effectively enough—forms such as the family contract, diversified services, and so on.

A detailed plan for the layout of downtown Tbilisi, and other city planning documents, have yet to be worked out. Individual housing construction is being conducted very poorly. A great many problems have accumulated in this regard, yet the Main Administration for Architectural Planning, and its chief Sh. D. Kavlashvili, have forced Tbilisians to spend years begging for permission to add on a porch or balcony, for example. Participants

in the conference have demanded that radical steps be taken to improve the work of this department.

Speakers have expressed alarm over the city population's lack of enough kindergartens and nurseries, requirements for which are being met by only 60 percent. Moreover, plans for the commissioning of establishments serving social needs are not being met. In a two-year period, the construction of kindergartens and nurseries totaled 1600 places fewer than planned. This year's target, apparently, will also not be met. Meanwhile, the Lenin, Kalinin, Ordzhonikidze, and 26 Commissars raykoms and rayispolkoms have failed to take effective measures to improve the situation. Good work has been done in this regard by officials of Pervoye Maya and Zavod rayons, who solved these problems by restoring and remodeling depreciated buildings.

Also in need of radical improvement is the work of the transport complex, where there is no sign of fundamental progress, the quality of passenger service is low, effectiveness in the utilization of the rolling stock is not improving, and the technical base is not being developed. The city's passenger transport is becoming increasingly unprofitable. The city's party and soviet organs must pay more attention to the subway as well. At any rate, 40 percent of those polled in a sociological survey expressed dissatisfaction with public transport. The same survey showed that 43.6 percent of the city's inhabitants are unhappy with the work of the communications enterprises, especially the telephone network.

The situation is no better in regard to medical services. One out of every two Tbilisians is unhappy with the work of the polyclinics, hospitals, and emergency services. Some 42 percent of the population had not had a regular checkup [dispanserizatsiya], which in any case is frequently conducted in a formalistic manner.

One out of every four persons polled does not trust the advice given by the physician in his polyclinic, and many citizens are dissatisfied with the physician's attitude toward his patients.

Problems of the ecology have been addressed with special urgency at the conference. Speakers have commented on the very high level of environmental pollution in the city and made specific proposals for the radical improvement of the city's "health."

The new conditions of management require radical restructuring of all work, because it will determine people's wellbeing and improve their standard of living.

This task will have to be dealt with by qualified cadres. Unfortunately, if we have to spend all our energy on endless rallies and demonstrations, at a time when the educational process has been severely disrupted in the VUZes (and elsewhere as well), there can be no reason for optimism. Conference participants have emphasized

that it is essential to direct our young people's reawakened national consciousness and growing activism away from rallies and demonstrations and into their studies, it is essential to enhance their consciousness that our Motherland and its economy and culture need highly-qualified cadres—knowledgeable, broadly educated people—and it is impossible to accomplish this without systematic and diligent studying.

Having made a critical analysis of all aspects of the party-political and social-economic life of the republic's capital city, conference participants instructed the newly constituted gorkom to undertake close monitoring of every constructive comment and proposal, to map out and implement specific measures to ensure high-quality efforts on the part of party and social organization so that the city organization—the militant vanguard of Georgia's Communist Party—will continue to lead the struggle for perestroika.

UzSSR Economy Falls Short in Many Areas in 1988

*18200217 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
31 Jan 89 p 1*

[Unsigned account of session of the UzSSR Council of Ministers held 28 January 1989]

[Text] This session of the UzSSR Council of Ministers, which was held 28 January, differed from previous ones both in its content and also in the forms in which it was conducted. Above all, in that not only were the results of performance of the republic's economy in 1988 totaled up, but also the activity of all its sectors in the first 3 years of the FYP was subjected to critical analysis, and the specific causes were revealed and names were named of the leaders who allowed the lag in fulfilling the plans which have been outlined. Broadcasting the session over television made it possible for the population of the republic to familiarize itself more closely with the progress in carrying out plans for socioeconomic development of UzSSR and its individual regions, and also to get answers to most of those questions which are being raised today in the work collectives of associations, enterprises, organizations, and institutions.

The first results of implementation of the economic reform were presented in the reports of A.R. Atadzhanov, chairman of the UzSSR Gosplan, and I.I. Mamatisayev, republic finance minister, and a description was given of the present state of financial work in the republic's economic complex. To be specific, it was noted that last year, say, the national income produced rose 5.1 percent as against the 0.8 percent called for in the plan. There was an increase in the volume of industrial production, three-fourths of the growth of industrial output and the entire volume of construction and installation work were achieved by raising labor productivity. State purchases of raw cotton, grain, most fruit and vegetables, and products of animal husbandry and plans for commodity sales were overfulfilled.

This time the floor was given in the session mainly to those members of the government who headed sectors in which there were shortcomings, oversights, and failure to take advantage of internal potential. An atmosphere of free exchange of opinions was created in the hall, but at the same time, the prevailing atmosphere was one of exactingness with respect to the assigned area of work. That is why many of them had to revise their reports as they were speaking, to evaluate what had been achieved more self-critically, and above all to concentrate attention on the problems that have come to a head and the strategies for solving them. For instance, attention was called to the fact that UzSSR Gosagroprom and the republic's Gosstroy had not fulfilled the principal economic indicators for the year and had allowed a sizable lag behind the 5-year plan. Serious complaints were also expressed in the speech by V.V. Sudarenkov, deputy chairman of the UzSSR Council of Ministers, addressed to the heads of ministries and departments, associations, and enterprises for ineffective use of production capacity, insufficient effort at retooling and reconstruction, and failure to fulfill a number of their plans for application of new technology.

A large group of interrelated questions, above all those related to social welfare, were discussed during the reports of chairmen of ispolkoms of soviets of people's deputies. The recommendation was made that S.D. Niyetullayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Karakalpak ASSR, concentrate the attention of ispolkoms of local soviets of people's deputies and construction contractors on the lag that has occurred and unconditional fulfillment of the plans of the FYP for activation of housing, hospitals, polyclinics, and children's preschool institutions, as well as on improving the production of fruit and vegetables. The Andizhan Oblast Ispolkom and its chairman E.R. Rakhimov were ordered to make a meaningful analysis of the causes of failure to fulfill plans for the production of raw cotton and for assimilation of resources in capital construction.

Summing up the results of the session, G.Kh. Kadyrov, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, concentrated attention of the members of the government and its staff and leaders of ispolkoms of soviets of people's deputies on the fact that certain constructive changes that had been outlined in the republic's economy had not so far taken on the momentum they should have or spread in all sectors of the economy. It was pointed out that unhealthy things are still persisting in the socioeconomic development of Uzbekistan and in a number of cases are even intensifying.

One out of every 4 enterprises in the republic had a smaller volume of production, and 170 industrial enterprises failed to fulfill plans for contract deliveries. The programs "Meat," "Milk," "Animal Feed," and "Fish," which have been drafted, were not backed up with persistent and purposive effort, and so far they have not been yielding the return they should. A strained situation still persists in the construction complex, where planning

targets have not been fulfilled for assimilating limit-allocation of state capital investments and construction and installation work, and there is a large lag in building projects in the sphere of social welfare. There has been no major increase in the receptivity of production to scientific-technical progress; for a number of enterprises and organizations it has not become an unflinching condition for restructuring economic activity.

Particular attention was paid to the problems of restoring the republic's economy to financial health. The standard assigned ratio between the rise of labor productivity and the rise of the average wage is not being adhered to. More than 100 enterprises and organizations in the agroindustrial and construction complexes, the furniture industry, and many branches are unable to make payments today. Targets for the first 3 years of the 5-year planning period were not fulfilled for the volume of commodity sales, for the rendering of paid services, for the production of consumer goods, and as a result the imbalance between personal income and personal expenditure has been aggravated further. It is no accident that on the very same day a session of the Presidium of the UzSSR Council of Ministers specifically examined the state of affairs in production of consumer goods in the republic. Summing up the results, the chairperson emphasized that all these shortcomings could have an adverse effect on the results of operation of the sphere of physical production, which as of 1 January 1989 made the full transition to the new economic conditions.

In the decree that was adopted, the UzSSR Council of Ministers noted that the heads of UzSSR ministries and departments, the Council of Ministers of the Karakalpak ASSR, oblispolkoms, and associations and enterprises under union jurisdiction failed in 1988 and the period of the 5-year planning period that has already passed to show the persistence required to guarantee restructuring of the operation of the republic's economy to meet the requirements of the economic reform and a vigorous social welfare policy.

It was recommended that by 10 February they conduct a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the 5-year planning period up to this point and, consistently developing the radical economic reform, take steps to reinforce the constructive trends that exist in the social reorientation of the economy and to strengthen intensive factors for development of production. Attention here should be paid above all to guaranteeing the rise of labor productivity, to fuller utilization of existing production capacities and physical resources, and to speeding up scientific-technical progress. Organizational and economic activity needs to be concentrated on solving the urgent problems of the rise in the prosperity of the people on the basis of the need to achieve appreciable favorable shifts in the food supply before the end of 1989, to furnish consumer goods and services to the public, and to strengthen the material and technical facilities of the social and cultural sphere.

R.N. Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbekistan CP CC, spoke in the session.

V.P. Anishchev, second secretary of the Uzbekistan CP CC, took part in the proceedings of the Council of Ministers.

Newspaper Courses in Buryat Language Introduced

18300399 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
21 Feb 89 p 3

[Article by V. Sbitnev: "Newspaper Courses in the Buryat Language"]

[Text] Ulan-Ude—The editorial board of the republic paper PRAVDA BURYATII has initiated an elective correspondence course in colloquial Buryat. It is being conducted by S. Budayev, doctor of philology.

The introductory article "A Word on the Buryat Language" contains some interesting information on the history of the Buryats and their language. It notes that

the 17th century was a turning point in the history of the Buryat tribes. With the incorporation of Buryatiya into the Russian state, Russian began to have an influence on the Buryat dialects. In time, Russian became not only the means of communication among the different nationalities, but also took on many functions of intra-nationality communication. Before the revolution the Buryats made widespread use of an ancient form of written Mongolian. It was used in business correspondence, private correspondence, philosophy, logic, linguistics, poetry, medicine, geography, astronomy, chronicles, and memoirs. In the Soviet period Old Mongolian fell into disuse and the Buryat literary language began to be codified on a different basis.

S. Budayev has based his elective course on the modern Buryat alphabet. The course will run one year. The newspaper will publish the "lessons" twice per week. The first lesson is entitled "Tanilsalga," meaning "Acquaintance." Clearly acquaintance with colloquial Buryat will benefit anyone living in the republic who cannot converse in the language of the local nationality.

10
22161

59

NTIS

ATTN: PROCESS 103
5285 PORT ROYAL RD
SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTS may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTS and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTS and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTS or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTS and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTS and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.